This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google books

https://books.google.com

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

No. 66.—JUNE 1, 1869.

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE

REVEALED FUTURE OF THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD.

EDITED BY

WILLIAM LEASK, D.D.

BODLEIAN LIBRARY
7 FEB 83
OXFORD.

CONTENTS:

THE PREDICTED RESTITUTION.

UNCLOTHED AND CLOTHED UPON.

IMMORTALITY—REPLY AND REJOINDER.

HELL: REGARDED AS A PLACE WHERE IT IS "GOOD" BUT NOT "HONOURABLE" TO BE.

THE SECOND ADVENT—CERTAIN AND SUDDEN.

DESTRUCTION OR EXTENDED RESTORATION.

LITERATURE.

POETRY.

"The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea."—HAB. ii. 14.

LONDON:

W. KENT & Co., PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

ALABASTER AND PASSMORE, STEAM PRINTERS, 31, LITTLE BRITAIN, E.C.

Digitized by Google

NOTICE.—Letters and Literary Correspondence to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Newington Green, London, N.

THE TRADE AND SUBSCRIBERS *will please to observe* that from and after this date, Messrs. W. KENT & Co., Paternoster Row, are the publishers of the *Rainbow*.

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To the Editor of the Rainbow.

SIR,—Permit me to express my great thankfulness that God has, after so many years of expectation, raised up advocates of the doctrine of Life in Christ, who seem every way fitted to commend it to the attention of the public. It is now twenty-five years since Mr. Dobney published his work on Future Punishment, and I accompanied him in testimony in my Four Discourses on the Scripture Doctrine of Immortality. Those deliverances of an early manhood have cost us both the serious sacrifices of a lifetime in discredit, loss, and the suspicion of the orthodox churches—evils only of late years surmounted by either of us; but I believe that the gravest review of what we did aforetime, now that we are beginning to be reckoned among the elders, only leads us to the conclusion that a thousand, yes, ten thousand life-times of rejection and disrepute would have been a cheap price to pay for the honour of serving God and man in testimony against the errors which were at that time almost wholly unassailed among believers.

Allow me to express, Mr. Editor, my admiration of the judgment, courage, and candour, which mark the writings of some of your leading contributors. Mr. Maude's paper in your March number, deserves to be reprinted and circulated by thousands. He seems never to have heard of the earlier battles fought in this cause, but I can assure him that the old soldiers look upon his mode of fighting almost with envy, wishing that in their youth they had known how to put the case as well as he puts it now. What, moreover, can be more complete, more judicial in tone, than Mr. Prebendary Constable's articles? I am sorry that necessity compels him to oppose our old friend, Mr. Henry Dunn; but although I differ from Mr. Dunn, let me mention a good deed of his, which I shall never cease to remember. At the very outset of my career, when a savage and deceitful article in the *Eclectic* was put forth in attempt to stifle both me and my then recently published book on *Life in Christ*, Mr. Dunn, at his own expense, printed a long reply to this article, and had it stitched into every number of the following *Eclectic*, with signally good effect. And whatever we may think of his doctrines now, this has been a sample of the man in real life all through.

Mr. Editor, we have seen some courageous avowals of conviction during the last few years. Mr. Minton has shown an example of all-sacrificing honesty, which is highly inspiriting and exemplary, quite apart from its bearing on this immediate controversy. During the next few years the public will be startled with other unexpected confessions of belief. Some of the very foremost men among the Congregationalists, the best scholars, the "chief priests" of that sect, will, I doubt not, before long, edify the public with their candid expressions of faith in these much abused doctrines. It is my firm belief that the old doctrine is losing its hold on nearly all the best minds, and that many are in that transition state in which any fine morning may witness their open avowal of sympathy with he truth. What we need, and must pray for, is more "boldness." For my own part, I purpose to deliver a series of discourses on the Theology of our Missionary Societies, during the present month, of which, if agreeable, I will send one to the *Rainbow* for July, on "*The hindrance to belief in the gospel, both at home and abroad, caused by the doctrine of the endless misery of the idolatrous nations of past and present times.*". Let all who have been favoured to learn the truth, in

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

JUNE 1, 1869.

THE PREDICTED RESTITUTION.

"Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began."—Acts iii. 21.

THESE words carry us forward to a blessed period of the world's destiny which, amid the strife and turmoil of its present condition, it is most refreshing to contemplate. They tell us of a time when the last echoes of the Lord's judgments shall have died away, when the whirlwind of his wrath, and the earthquake, and the fiery desolation with which this dispensation is to terminate, will be over and gone; and there shall succeed the peaceful calm, and a smiling and renovated earth, clothed once more with all the beauty of the paradise of God, and fit for the dwelling place of the redeemed. There is something most tranquilising to our very spirits in looking forward to scenes of blessedness like these, for we have no such repose in our present condition. The world, as it now is, presents a sad picture to the Christian's view. We look around us, and within us, and we see sin prevailing, and dark clouds gathering on every side. There are "fears within, and fightings without." The overflowing of ungodliness makes us afraid; the earth is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; the professing church is vexed with strife, and the whole creation groans under the curse; so that, if we look only upon things which are seen, we should be "of all men the most miserable." But "we walk by faith, not by sight." This is our privilege, and while it is our privilege, it is also our comfort and our refreshment, in this tempestuous state of human things, "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen." *Faith* is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of

Digitized by Google

things not seen; and when we look forward by faith, there floods before our contemplation the prospect of our inheritance, in all its loveliness, and in all its reality. Nor is it a vain and delusive vision of the coming future that we gaze upon; for it is the word of the true and living God that sets before us the glorious scene, and that maps out for us the pleasant land. The world, indeed, has its day dreams, and its visions of imagination, which will end in disappointment. There are men who ignore the Bible, and disown Christianity altogether, who will tell you of a grander and a better day which is in store for our species, and whether it is to be brought about by the progress of science or the spread of education, or by measures of secular improvement, they anticipate it without any reference to the Scripture, and they expect the regeneration of the world without a Saviour, without God.

But that which these *un*inspired prophets doat upon, the prophets of the Bible do most certainly hold out to the faithful. "We have a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts." And while the visions of infidel philosophy, being based upon falsehood, will issue in "shame and everlasting contempt," the bright and heavenly visions which are unfolded in Scripture are full of reality and truth, and will never fall short of the most sanguine expectations. The believer has every possible warrant for his faith and hope. For him, indeed, there is a golden age: attested by prophets, apostles, and evangelists; and it is God himself who throws open to him in his word an exquisite vista, terminating in a day of blessedness which shall fill the whole world with his glory.

This is the glorious day referred to in the text. It is the day of God, when "he shall send Jesus Christ, whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world begun."

1. Consider, first, "*What are the times which are here spoken of?*" The apostle Peter is speaking to the Jewish people, and exhorting them to repent and be converted, that they might be prepared for the second coming of Christ: "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and *he shall send Jesus Christ*, whom the heaven must receive *until* the times of restitution of all things." Observe, therefore, that the times here spoken of are the times when God shall send Jesus Christ. This can relate to no spiritual coming, but to a personal coming. For there is not a single passage of Scripture in which God the Father is said to *send* Jesus Christ, except with reference to his *First* or *Second* coming into the world in his own person. But when the apostle spoke, the

Digitized by Google

first coming was past. Christ had come in the flesh, and died upon the cross, and risen again from the dead, and ascended up into heaven; and, therefore, the sending of Jesus Christ, spoken of in the context, can only be understood of his Second Personal Advent; and it is here stated that *then* shall be "the times of the restitution of all things."

2. Now, what does *restitution* mean? It means the *re*-placing of anything into its original state; the restoration of anything that has been injured, or fallen into decay, and the reconstruction of it according to its former plan; as, for instance, the reparation of a ruined temple. Now, it will be just so at "the restitution of all things." The world which is now in ruins, so to speak, shall then be restored to its former magnificence and perfection. It is beautiful even now, in its fallen state; and we can discover, in its degenerated ruins, something of the grandeur of the original building. "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches." Everywhere we may trace the beauty of the divine workmanship, though it has been defaced and marred. When it came fresh from the hands of its Creator, there was no imperfection. On the evening of the sixth day, "God saw *everything* that he had made, and behold, it was very good." To that state it will be restored at the time of "the restitution of all things;" for then the curse which sin has brought upon it shall be removed; the world will be reconstructed, according to the original design of its divine Artificer, and Satan shall not have the boast of having so marred the work of the Almighty, as to lead him to blot it out of the universe. No; "we, according to this promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Peter iii. 13.)

There are some, indeed, who will tell us that it is in "heaven" that this restitution takes place. But how can this be? We can understand how restitution can apply to a ruined world, and to the restitution of its lost purity and happiness. We can understand how it can relate to the rebuilding of the tabernacle of God on earth, which has been thrown down, to the replacing of the word's sceptre into holy hands: and the bringing back of all things into subjection, "to the second Adam, the Lord from heaven." We can understand how it can relate to the re-establishment of righteous government, when Christ shall come to "put down all rule, and authority, and power," which is not holy and righteous power: when he shall "restore the kingdom unto Israel," and "build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down, and build again the ruins thereof." But how can restitution refer to heaven, where there is nothing that needs reparation or renewal?

Surely, the restitution must be *in the very scene* which has been deteriorated by sin. "Heaven," says the Duke of Manchester, in his *Finished*

Digitized by Google

Mystery, "has nothing to be restored; and *hell* will perform the office for which it was prepared; but as the *earth* has been *deteriorated*, so the earth shall be severed."

2ndly. But we shall gain further insight into the nature of "the restoration of all things," if we refer to another word which is used in the New Testament to express it: that word is, *Regeneration*. "Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Matt. xix. 28.)

This word regeneration only occurs *twice* in the New Testament: once in this passage, where it relates to the renovation of the earth in the times of restitution; and once in St. Paul's epistle to Titus, where it relates to the regeneration of the heart by the Holy Ghost. "We are thus reminded," as it has been well remarked, "how close is the connection between the present renewal of the Christian and the future regeneration of the world. The same word is set apart by the Holy Spirit to describe both these events. The true church are the first fruits of God's creatures, and the first fruits are a sure pledge of the harvest that will follow. The grace of God in the regenerate soul, is an effectual earnest of that future glory. The inward renewal of the heart in this life can alone secure us a place in the regeneration to come. (Rev. xxi.) The one is the seed, the other is the blossom (unfolded). The one is the spring and fountain of life in the soul of the believer; the other is that ocean of joy and blessedness into which it must eternally flow."

Now, with regard to this regeneration, clearly it is connected with the kingdom of Christ which he will receive as the "*Son of man*," and in which he will reign over the earth, together with his saints. It is the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory; and *when* shall this be? If we look to Matt. xxv. 31, we shall find the answer, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory;" that is, when he comes again, he will sit upon *his own* throne, as contradistinguished from *his Father's* throne, where he now sits; and where, as one with the Father in his eternal Godhead, he sat before the foundation of the world. (It is important to notice the distinction between the throne of God, which the Son of man shares with the Father, and the throne of Christ which, at his second coming, he will share with the saints.) This distinction is strongly marked in Rev. iii. 21: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit *with me* in *my throne*, even as I also overcame, and am set down *with my Father* in *his throne*." For to this end was he born, not only that he might "give his life a ransom for many;" not only that he might fulfil

Digitized by Google

the prophetic and the priestly office; but that *he might be a king*, according as it is written of him, and as God spake to the virgin Mary, by the mouth of his holy angel, "Thou shalt bring forth a Son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke i. 31—33.)

Now, *in point of fact*, has the latter part of this ever been fulfilled? Christ, in his human nature, has not yet reigned over the house of Jacob. "King of the Jews" was his title at his death, but he has never yet occupied the throne of his father David; and he has never yet been acknowledged by his own nation as their King and their Messiah. This he will be when they shall see him in the clouds of heaven, and shall say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord;" and *then* shall be the *Regeneration*, when he shall sit on "the throne of his glory; then, not only as king of Israel, but as King of all the earth, he shall wield his sceptre over a righteous and a renovated world. And the saints shall reign *with* them, and they shall be "kings and priests unto God and the Father." Christ has appointed unto them *a kingdom*, and when he comes in his glory, they shall be associated with him in that glory, and shall have part with him in the government of the earth. Thus we find that the apostle Paul refers to this as an acknowledged and recognised truth in the early church. "Do ye not know," he says to the Corinthians, "that the saints shall judge the world?" (1 Cor. vi. 2.) And just so it is that our Lord and Saviour himself speaks, "To him that overcometh will I give to sit with me in my throne: even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." (Rev. iii. 21.) And again, "He that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: as the vessels of a potter shall then be broken in shivers: even as I received of my Father." (Rev. ii. 27, and Rev. xix. 15.) How striking also is that passage in the hundred and forty-ninth Psalm. It relates to the same subject, and it will have its fulfilment when the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and shall judge the world. "For the Lord taketh pleasure in his people. He will beautify the meek with salvation. Let the saints be joyful in glory. Let them sing aloud upon their beds;" that is the place where they rest from their labours—let them sing in anticipation of the coming triumph. "Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand: to execute vengeance upon the heathen, and punishments upon the people: to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with links of iron; and execute upon them the judgment written; this honour have all his saints."

Digitized by Google

3rdly. We may take yet another word out of the New Testament, as illustrative of the times of restitution of which we speak—*Redemption.* St. Paul, in writing to the Ephesians, of the "*Day of Redemption,*" says, that the Holy Spirit is the "earnest of our inheritance, until the *redemption* of the purchased possession." And thus our Lord, when referring to the signs of his approaching advent, encourages his faithful followers by saying, "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your *redemption* draweth nigh." Now, in each of these passages, the word redemption is applied to a time which is yet future; and it relates to the *full* and *complete* deliverance of God's church at the second coming of Christ; to their perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul. "when they shall receive the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world."

In *one sense,* indeed, the redemption of the church is *complete, i.e.,* as to the price that has been paid, and the blessings which have been purchased. For Christ gave himself a ransom for all, and "by his one oblation of himself once offered, he made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

But the effects of redemption are incomplete. For if we look to the saints on earth, though a mighty change has passed upon them, though their understandings are enlightened, and their hearts renewed by the Holy Spirit, yet how many sad traces of their natural corruption remain! How dim is their spiritual vision, and how little do they understand of the Divine truth! Vain thoughts and evil imaginations disturb and distract them; their prayers are hindered, and their praises are often heartless. Fearful, oftentimes, is the strife that goes on within them, between sin and holiness—between God's will and their own, between the love of the Father and the love of the world. And besides all this, and besides Satan's sore temptations, there are the weakness, the imperfections, the weariness, the diseases of our mortal bodies, so that, as the apostle says, "We that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house that is from heaven."

Then again, if we look to "them who sleep in Jesus," even they have not received the full effects of redemption. For death still retains their bodies in the grave, and they as well as we are "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body," waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and looking forward to the winding up of the work of redemption. For though they rest from all toil and sorrow, they know full well that the earth is still under Satan's bondage, and they long for the Redeemer's triumph, and their own participation in it.

And if we look, lastly, to the visible creation, and to the framework of the world we live in, does not the apostle tell us that "the whole creation

Digitized by Google

groaneth and travaileth in pain until now"? The volcano, the earthquake, and the storm, plague, pestilence, and famine, desolating floods, and wasting blights, and mildews: these are the tokens of a world which has been made "subject to vanity," and upon which has descended the curse of Adam's sin; the whole face of nature is defiled; and, as it has been beautifully expressed, the earth is now "a wreck of what she was: still lovely in many of her aspects, though in sore distress; still majestic, and venerable, though a venerable ruin, appearing as out of joint; and giving token, by her extended deserts, and the gloom of her unpeopled solitudes, and her wintry frowns, and her many fierce and fitful agitations, that some mysterious ailment hath befallen her." But when the day of redemption shall come, all these evils shall be done away, the church shall no longer be vexed with sin, nor bowed down with sorrow, nor buffeted by Satan, the body will be no more a clog, and a hindrance. For then will have taken place, at the *first* resurrection, "the redemption of the body;" they that are Christ's shall rise at his coming, and we that are alive and remain shall be changed into the same *immortality*, and "death shall be swallowed up in victory."

And then, too, shall the effects of redemption extend to the world itself, and the creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God; together with man, it will be emancipated from defilement and dishonour, and shall come forth in everlasting beauty and unfading loveliness, to minister alike to the wishes of its inhabitants and its Creator's glory. And hence it is, that when the times of restitution of all things are spoken of, and the coming of the Redeemer is announced, all nature is summoned to an act of adoration to its Maker's praise. The voice of melody is heard from the mountains and the forest. The valleys and the rocks are made to sing. The whole of the inanimate creation is represented as vocal; and in one universal chorus it hails the Lord's advent and celebrates the jubilee of the earth: "The floods clap their hands and the hills be joyful together *before the Lord*, for he cometh to judge the earth; with righteousness shall he judge the world and the people with equity."

Christ has redeemed this world of ours. He has paid the price of his own most precious blood to get it back from Satan's power, under which it fell in consequence of Adam's sin. "For this purpose the Son of God was *manifested* that he might destroy the works of the devil;" and destroy them he will, not only in the souls and bodies of his redeemed people, but in the world itself, through every one of its departments; when he takes to himself his great power, when he removes the curse of sin, and casts out Satan from the earth, as it is written, and shuts him up in the bottomless pit, and sets a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more,

Digitized by Google

then will be the redemption of the purchased possession, the devil will be prince of the world no longer, the government of the earth shall be wrested from him; and "kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever."

To sum up what has been said upon this part of the subject, here are three Scriptural words by which the future condition of the world is described.

First, *Restitution,* not the annihilation of this material world—not the blotting it out of the universe of God, as if it had never been; but the replacing it into its former state—not *Destruction,* but *Renovation;* the reparation of the mischief which sin has produced, and the restoration of God's work in all its original beauty and perfection.

Secondly, *Regeneration,* that is, the world's new birth—that like as the regenerate sinner is created anew in Christ Jesus, that henceforth he may become a habitation of God by the Spirit: so this fallen world might have its new birth also, and become a fit dwelling place for the saints when he that is to sit upon the throne shall say, "Behold, I make all things new."

Thirdly, *Redemption,* that is, the getting back of a lost inheritance, by the payment of a price: and this price has Jesus paid. The world belongs to him. It was his by ancient covenant before it was created, "for all things were made by him and for him," and he has made it his by righteous purchase since. That which the first Adam had lost and forfeited by sin, the second Adam regained by redemption, and overpaid its value with his blood. In due time the full effects of this redemption shall be manifested, and Christ shall have the world for his possession and inheritance; as it is written, "Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."

Fourthly. To these three Scriptural words, we may just add one more.

Refreshing. "The times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord." That is, breathing time, rest. Now, the Christian has no respite from conflict, and effort, and temptation. His safety lies in continually struggling; and his joys are those of gaining fresh conquests, not of established peace. The world in its present state is not rest, "there remaineth a rest for the people of God." The word in Greek, *Sabbatismos* here translated, meaning literally, "the keeping of a Sabbath," seems to be a recognition of the well-known Jewish opinion that Messiah's kingdom of blessedness would occupy the seventh thousand years of the world, answering to the seventh day of rest, after the six days of creation. The same opinion prevailed amongst the early fathers of the church; and it is beautifully alluded to by our Christian poet, Cowper, in his "Task," Book VI.

Digitized by Google

The belief has been entertained among all civilised people from Egypt downwards, and by all classes of religionists, that this world is *a week* world, six working days and a Sabbath.

We are on the eve of a momentous crisis in the history of the world—"For the Lord will finish the work, and cut it short, in righteousness; because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth;" soon may take place the *first* resurrection, "For unto them that *look for him* (the Lord Jesus Christ) shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." The midnight cry is already made, and it waxes louder and deeper. "Behold the bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him." "*They who look for him*" shall be removed from the earth. "Them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent (go before) them who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord; wherefore comfort one another with these words." And this may take place at any moment, for it is written, "Watch, therefore, for ye know not the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh." "Be ye ready, for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." Soon may the Jews return to their land, rebuild their temple, and re-establish their ordinances. A prospectus has been already issued for that purpose, and a society formed for restoring the Jews to the Holy Land.

When the Lord God gives unto Jesus the throne of his father David, then shall be heard great voices in heaven saying, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." Then shall the Lord Jesus enter upon his glorious reign with his saints for one thousand years. "Then shall the earth be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." "Then shall the Messiah have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth; and men shall be blessed in him—all nations shall call him blessed."

And then, what a change to this very earth which has so long been groaning! what deliverance and joy! Christ upon his throne, the beast and the false prophet in the abyss; and Satan bound in chains; the saints exalted and glorified; the wicked trodden under foot and put to shame; the curse removed; paradise restored; Israel gathered; the Gentiles converted; creation blessed; and Jehovah, in the person of Immanuel, reigning with his risen and glorified saints in peace and righteousness over the happy nations of this earth.

Digitized by Google

Do chronological prophecies as well as the signs of the times indicate that the second advent of our Lord is near? "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." Accepted in Christ now, and clothed in his righteousness, may we so "occupy till he come," that when he cometh we may be received by him, with the welcome words, "Well done, good and faithful servants, enter ye into the joy of your Lord."

Falstone. JOHN MASON.

UNCLOTHED AND CLOTHED UPON.

(OUTLINE SUGGESTIONS.)

"We that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."—2 Cor. v. 4.

IN the previous chapter the apostle refers to his constant exposure to death (verses 10, 11), yet rejoiced in the thought of the resurrection through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ (verse 14); and it is the subject matter of this fourteenth verse, which is continued and expanded from the commencement of this fifth chapter. In the verses intervening he refers to the spiritual joy and soul-growth of those who are lifting their eyes above the things seen and temporal to those which are unseen, yet eternal—who are really looking for the "blessed hope," the "exceeding and eternal weight of glory"—and thus consistently prepare themselves for the coming of their Lord. Of this chapter may not the apostle's meaning, in the first few verses, be as follows:—we know that if we, believers, fall asleep in death, we shall be raised again, and surely join the living watching ones, who will be suddenly changed at the time of the Lord's coming into the air? Whilst we are in this body on earth we groan, being burdened; and earnestly desire that new body which shall be given at the period of the resurrection from among the dead, or at the instantaneous change of the living; for if we be "clothed we shall not be found naked," we shall not be left behind at the Lord's *parousia*, and men will not see us shamed.

This fourth verse implies something put off, and something put on, and for this last the apostle expresses his anxious desire.

1. That unclothing—what is it? The separation of the soul from the body, under the illustration of the taking down of a tabernacle; the body a wonderful structure, reared by the great Artificer of all things, admirably adapted for its tenant, a house, but unstable building; tabernacle, like a shepherd's tent, capable of removal from place to place.

Digitized by Google

Destined to be taken down; subject to the law of decay; the law of dissolution is operating on the body every moment; to a certain period of life this law is to some extent counteracted, but the time comes when the frame is reduced to itsprimiti ve elements.

An event certain; as proved in the departure of all past generations, and declared in Scripture; and even the sudden change, to those ready at the Saviour's coming, will be equivalent to death; the old body will be put off.

Necessary; the body as it is, with all its present feculent grossness, could find no place in the heavenlies; by death or by the sudden change, there must be the putting off of the mortal.

This taking down of the tabernacle may be by lingering illness, or almost suddenly, or quite so.

2. That clothing upon—what?

The reunion of the soul with the new body; the putting on of the new body.

This will be at the resurrection, to the great majority of the members of the body of Christ a glorious fact; plainly proclaimed by the Lord Jesus (John v., vi.) and by the apostle (1 Thess. iv. 14, 17); and this is the putting on of the immortal. (1 Cor. xv. 42—49.)

Nature suggests it; all Scripture implies it.

This will also be when Christ's waiting ones shall be changed at his coming. (1 Cor. xv. 51.) "We shall not all sleep;" *i.e.*, we have said this change will be equivalent to sudden death, the dissolution of the earthly and the clothing upon with the immortal. That day and circumstance must come, and may to us; who can show that it cannot? Then it is right and wise to contemplate it as a possible event in our day.

What will it be to those loving the thoughts of it, and waiting, watching for it? (1 Thess. iv. 17.) Paul told them to comfort one another with these words (verse 18); doubtless they did so. We ought to do so also.

The Church of the Thessalonians was a pattern church. They waited not for the Spirit's outpouring, not for the fulfilment of any prophecy, not for the conversion of the world, but for the Son of Man.

3. A recognition of the believer's desire. Paul speaks for himself and others. The apostle expresses his anxious desire, not for death, but for the change. There are various reasons for the believer's doing so.

Then every burden would be removed: "Here we groan, being burdened." All burdens then gone, the innumerable pains and sicknesses, indwelling corruption, unbelief, all ignorance, pride, and every abomination of the heart, no more complaining like Paul (Rom. vii. 24), no more Satanic temptations, wicked society, crosses, afflictions, all toil over, the race ended,

Digitized by Google

the warfare accomplished, no more braving perils, opposing powers, enduring hardships, no more watching, warring, fainting. The true rest is obtained, every sigh is hushed, every tear wiped away.

Such the joy of the disembodied, but how greatly increased in the new body!

Then we have a permanent dwelling: the contrast between the tabernacle and house striking; consider the difference between a marquee and a cathedral structure.

The new body shall be like Christ's for beauty, vigour, purity, and endurance; and further, like the Saviour's resurrection body in its wonderful capacity to become visible or invisible, ascend or descend, eat and drink, or refrain.

Then we escape the sufferings often connected with death; these sometimes great.

Then we have not to wait for the coming of Christ's Kingdom; the disembodied, or as they are termed, "the dead in Christ," are still waiting, happy, yet not perfected.

Then mortality will be swallowed up of life; the present state is comparatively but existence, yet the commencement of that which is worthy of the name of life with the Lord. Death gone; this ultimately shall be the case with all the earth (Isaiah xxv. 8), but the case at once with those who are changed; wonderful their position and dignity. (Rev. iv.)

HINTS.

How wonderful the love of Christ, in not only rescuing, saving, but also glorifying.

How gratefully should we commit ourselves unto him, as our substitute and Saviour.

How foolish to live without him; "Ye must be born again."

How wise to live waiting and expecting him; he may come at any moment.

Have faith in Jesus Christ: rest upon his atonement; believe. "He that believeth hath everlasting life."

Exeter. E. TUCKETT.

Digitized by Google

"IMMORTALITY," REPLY.

ALLOW me to offer a few remarks elicited by reading a paper, entitled, "Immortality," written by a professed believer in Jesus Christ; one who claims union with him in life eternal, and is waiting for the full development of that life in glory and immortality at the arrival of Jesus Christ. This Christian man thinks he has discovered, through the writings of others, and also from the Holy Scriptures, that the wicked—those who die unregenerated, unreconciled to God, through the death and atoning blood of Christ, not quickened together with him from the dead, or united to him who liveth for ever and ever—are annihilated, or cease to exist for ever! That there is no eternal punishment, no eternal fire, but that sinners cease to exist.

I have read his paper carefully through, and must confess it has caused me much grief of heart to perceive how such a man should allow *himself*, *i.e.*, his own feelings, his limited capacity for judgment in such a vast and weighty matter as that between the great God and judge of all and his guilty creatures, his wilfully hating and rebellious creatures, such as Satan and his angels, man and his fellows, all at enmity with God—to carry him away from true subjection to the plain and simple word of God.

In the first place, he confesses that these thoughts found a place in his mind originally from walking through the poor degraded streets of a great city, where he saw unmasked the most shameless wickedness, vice, depravity, and misery, of a large portion of human beings, who were, according to his then belief, to be brought into judgment, and punished eternally for their sins. Yes, judged by Jesus, the Son of man and Son of God, according to their works.

The awfulness of this fact he thought himself called upon and qualified to consider and pass a judgment upon. It was to his finite mind a great mystery and profound difficulty.

It was a great deliverance to that perplexed mind when, years afterwards, he read "a thoughtful book," in which another man declared his own want of faith that these poor, vicious, hateful, and hating-one-another beings were worthy of, and about to put on, a bright immortality in a new and perfect creation; for which belief there is certainly no call or warrant given in all the Scriptures.

Dear man, did not his thoughts carry him a little further back, and try to fathom the mystery of evil, and its existence at all, why it has been permitted? Why there should have been allowed the fall, through pride, of such intelligent beings as Satan and his angels? If we are to solve all mysteries, even by searching the Scriptures, why have those Scriptures declared so plainly to check our enquiries, and put down our arrogant reasonings and daring judgment of things that *are*, and things declared *shall be*, whether they be right or wrong by such words as these?

"Secret things belong to God, but those that are revealed belong to us and our children." (Deut. xxix. 29.) "God is greater than man, and

Digitized by Google

giveth no account of his matters. He doth not take counsel of us, neither doth he allow us to bring his acts or counsel before the bar of our judgment. Canst thou, by searching, find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know? If he cut off, and shut up, or gather together, who can hinder him?" (Job xi., xxxiii.) Indeed, if we had capacity to judge God, and solve all mysteries of things that are, how they came, and why they are, we should truly be as gods; and this is the secret of all these questions, and this striving in man to strain the Scriptures and make them speak, not what they do speak, but what he thinks they ought to speak. There are two classes of reasoners, who are now striving upon this great deep sea, in order to make the word of God on one side to teach annihilation, on the other side universal salvation; both being determined there shall be no eternal punishment. I make these remarks especially in reference to the fearful, impious thoughts that crop up in man's heart through the fiery darts of the wicked one, as expressed in the close of this Christian's paper. No wonder the writer trembles. Let him know, then, that God is LOVE, and this is always said in connection with the gift of his Son; and it is the rejection of this LOVE that is set forth in the lake of fire as the just doom of those who oppose to LOVE their incorrigible HATE. The seed of the serpent are they, and finally banished eternally from the sound of LOVE, which is of God!

What say the Scriptures of God upon this subject? I have no hesitation in declaring that death nowhere in the word of God means non-existence. It doth everywhere mean a certain condition of existence, and is everywhere connected with sin. Sin and death are a condition of being. Righteousness and life are also a condition of existence. Righteousness and life are inseparably connected. "If there had been a law that could have given life, verily righteousness had been by the law."

Then we must go back to the beginning, and remember that the man is not the body, nor the body the man. That God formed the body, and then breathed into it a living soul. The body is only a tabernacle for the man; faculties and instruments for the man to live in, walk, and act in. Then, we must not confuse the two men, the first man and the second Man. "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul: the last Adam a life-giving Spirit. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second Man is the Lord from heaven." We are not brought back into Adam's first condition as a living soul, but must accept the end in judgment of *that* in the death and cross of Christ, our sin and judgment bearer, that we may be quickened out of our sin and death condition into the life of the second Man. The living soul man, now dead in sin, is not resuscitated in the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, but brought to nought, and we are new created, begotten again into a new life in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; who, because of our death in Adam, and liability to further judgment for our own sins, himself bore our sins in his own body, and as the living One, lay among the dead under judgment, that he might, by tasting death under wrath for our sins, abolish death and judgment for all who receive him, and become the head of a new race, crowned with glory, and honour, and set over all.

Adam, the first, was made a living soul, every thing was put under him, but he was warned that if he disobeyed God he would die in the very day

Digitized by Google

he broke his allegiance to God. He disobeyed, and died. He lost all communion with God, and his first estate as lord over all things. He was led captive by Satan, and tremblingly hid from the presence of God. He was morally dead, with a guilty conscience, and he chose darkness rather than light—the absence from God if he could find it. He had not, however, lost his existence, but he was *dead* in sin. Moreover, God added and pronounced the dissolution of his body for a time. His earthy tabernacle was dust, and unto dust it should return. Then, the first man being dead, and all dead in him, yea, the whole creation subjected to vanity in hope, God revealed his purpose in the Coming One. The WORD OF LIFE, who, as the seed of a woman, should destroy him who had thus obtained the power of death through Adam's fall into his snare; and this he would do through death! Adam took hold of this Word of Life by faith, accepted the promised deliverance, and as he had before named every living creature, he now re-named the woman *Cheva*, Life, because, said he, She is the mother of the *Living One*. He, Adam, was then, through his sin, dead, and his body doomed to dissolution, but, as a dead man he took hold of the *living One*, the WORD, who was the *Life* and *Light* of man from that moment of Adam's faith and adhesion to him. God approved this his faith, and the kids being slain, and (we must, I think, assume) offered up, as Abel's was afterwards, as an expression of faith in him who was through death to reconcile man to God in a *new life*, God clothed both Adam and Eve with the skins of the the slain lambs. Thus clothed by God from the sacrifice, they were justified from sin, and walked with God through the Spirit, in faith, love, and hope. From this time, the promised seed was the acknowledged Word of Life, and all who acknowledged him were justified unto life, waiting until he should be manifested, until he could be looked upon and handled by the hands of his disciples, and by all of us who believe in him as risen from the dead. (1 John i. 1, 2, 3.)

I fully grant that the word immortal soul, if it would imply that it was morally dead, is a wrong term; but if it be used as incorruptible, in contrast to the body which is *corruptible*, then it is correct. It should be translated, incorruptible soul; for *corruption* is always applied to the body only. The soul is dead until it is united to the risen Christ; then "it is life because of righteousness," though our bodies are still mortal because of sin, though still existing. And it was when our whole man was dead that we heard the voice of the Son of God and lived (John v.), we *then* passed *from death* unto *life*, but we were in existence before. Our friend sets forth a very strange proof that death means annihilation. He quotes many passages of Scripture that declare that life which is only in Christ Jesus is given to a dead world, saying, "He that hath the Son hath life, but he that hath not the Son hath not life:" therefore he his non-existent, annihilated. If death cannot consist with existence, then all who have not yet received Christ, are in a state of *annihilation*, unconscious nothingness.

John declares (chap. iii.), "He that believeth not the Son of God shall not see life, but the wrath of God *remaineth on him*." We are born children of wrath by nature even as others, and if not quickened together with Christ, must remain so eternally, as far as we have at present any revelation from God.

I maintain, from Scripture, there is no mention of any wicked man passing out of existence, although swept away, in judgment, from the face

Digitized by Google

of the earth. All must stand up in body and soul before the white throne, and all receive their final doom in body and soul. I was much struck by our friend's censure of the heathen philosopher *supposing* the existence of men after the death of their bodies, and inventing the word Tartarus to designate the abode of departed spirits.

Certainly, the Holy Ghost agrees not with him, by allowing the apostle Peter to use the very word, saying, "that God spared not the angels who sinned, but cast them down to Tartarus under chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." (2 Peter ii. 4, *Greek.*) So, the spirits of the antediluvian unbelievers are preserved in prison unto judgment; so, the sinners of Sodom and Gomorrah; so, all the unjust are reserved unto the day of judgment to be punished. Our Lord, when he died under judgment and wrath for our sins, was verily dead, but *never out of existence* (of course, I mean as man). His soul went to Hades, his body to the tomb; so, all men who have died in their bodies from the beginning have never lost their existence. Their spirits are alluded to continually as about to rise again in body, either to judgment or to eternal life.

Believers who have died in their bodies are said to be *dead in Christ.* Surely they exist. The *elders* who have died in the faith are *waiting* to be perfected at the first resurrection. Our Lord's description, by a parable, of the state of departed souls, declares that the rich man, after he had died and been buried, lifted up his eyes and beheld Lazarus afar off; surely this implies existence!

The expressions adduced from Scripture supposed to prove annihilation, such as, The wicked shall be as chaff driven away, burnt up as stubble, as thorns in the fire, as a dream passing away, as the fat of rams, and as tow and tares, every one to the destruction of their persons here in their bodies, as by the flood, at Sodom and Gomorrah, the destruction of Sennacherib's armies, the wicked nations before Israel, the judgment to come upon the beast and his nations, the judgment upon Gog and Magog before and after the Millennium—all these are slain in their bodies to rise again and be judged at the great white throne. The words destruction and perdition must be understood in the same way. Destroyed out of God's happy creation; perished from his presence; cast into outer darkness, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, blackness and darkness for ever—*everlasting punishment* in juxtaposition with *everlasting life.* The judgment of the great day is said to be "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." Thus the punishment of those who know not God, and obey not the gospel, is declared to be *everlasting destruction* from the *presence* of the Lord, and from the power of his glory. Here the nature of the destruction is clearly defined, when all who are then saved in Christ enjoy his presence and are blessed in the power of his glory, these shall be everlastingly excluded. To this agree the words of our Lord in several places, speaking of the doom of the wicked; Hell, or Gehenna, as the unquenched fire, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. The carcases in the valley of Hinnom, when their worm *consumed* them they died, and the fire went out; but those who go into the lake of fire are never consumed, therefore their worm dieth not, the fire is not quenched. The Lord says also that *every one* shall be salted with fire, *i.e.*, preserved by fire; but *every sacrifice* salted with salt, *i.e.*, with the grace of life, the eternal life of Christ, living sacrifices, preserved for the new creation.

Digitized by Google

This is the covenant of salt, the everlasting covenant or dispensation of God; this we enter into by faith, otherwise we shall be preserved for and in everlasting punishment. He adds, have salt in yourselves and have peace one with another; if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? The answer is above, "Salted with fire."

Again, the Lord will say, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Not originally for man, neither the *necessary* consequence of Adam's sin; but the consequence of man's unbelief and practical rebellion against God, in his now state of death in sin; refusing to hear God, to receive his mercy, loving the dead state in which he is born and existing, rather than the life given in Christ.

In Revelation xx. 10, we perceive the everlasting fire prepared for Satan and his angels is *not annihilation*. We read that when he is cast in, the beast and false prophet, who had been cast in alive, or existing, 1,000 years previous, are there still unconsumed, existing in that *second death*, and there Satan shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever. So, also, all those who worship the beast (Rev. xiv. 9—11) shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and the Lamb for ever and ever. This must take place from the judgment of the white throne, after the final resurrection. The beast, false prophet, and Satan, being already in the lake. (Rev. xx. 15.) Now, let us mark that this *expression* is always used to denote the eternal existence of God; (Rev. xv.), "The wrath of God who liveth for ever; (chap. xi. 15), the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, and he shall reign for ever; (chap. x. vi,), and swear by him who liveth for ever and ever; (chap. vii. 12), the multitudes come out of the great tribulation, worship, saying: Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever." Note also their *endurance* in this state of blessing and worship, serving God day and night, as said of the endurance of those in torment, *day and night*. (chap. v.) The angels praise him who sitteth on the throne for ever and ever; the four living creatures, and twenty-four elders, worship him who liveth for ever and ever, as in chap. iv. verse 9; and in all these places the same Greek word is used, *unto the ages of ages!* Now, how dare we to say that in one the words mean unto *eternity*—in the other unto *annihilation?*

But my friend declares that the Scriptures say things in sharp contrast to all this. I ask where? Oh, he says, Rev. xxi.—"I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And the tabernacle of God (the body of Christ, Eph. ii.) is with men, and he will dwell with them, and there shall be no more death." *All* the *former* things passed away, and *all things new!* Well, Peter tells us (2 Peter iii.), the first heaven and the first earth overflowed with water, *perished*. But had the souls of wicked men been annihilated? or were they reserved unto judgment? or were Abel, Enoch, or Adam, annihilated because the heavens and earth were perished? Then God renewed the surface and the atmosphere of this globe again. The heavens and earth that now are! None of those who existed on the first will reappear until the first resurrection, at the near approaching day of the Lord. Then those who obtain that will rise and reign with Christ one thousand years; at the close, this heavens

Digitized by Google

and earth will fly away from the face of the great white throne, which will be seen with a Sitter on it. Then shall the dead stand in bodies raised up, or as it is expressed, *the dead will live again* (but surely not in the life of Christ whom they have rejected!) before God and be judged. This is the resurrection to judgment (John v. 29), the resurrection to life having been at the commencement of the thousand years. Some may, then, such as those who died in babyhood, and others, be found in the Lamb's book of life, and receive life in and from him; but those not found there will be cast into the lake of fire, and then all having been done, we have the last revelation of the results given to us. The new heavens and earth where God tabernacles with man! The day of GOD, which our CHRIST, as the Son of Man, has ushered in, and into which he delivers all whom he has saved—*all* who by faith in him have overcome! all who have taken of the water of life so freely given in him! THEY shall inherit these things; BUT the fearful, the unbelieving, abominable, etc., etc.; there they are in the lake of fire, to be tormented for ever and ever. THIS IS THE SECOND DEATH! no more annihilation than the first death, which Christ will have then abolished; and all who, persisting in resisting the redemption in Christ's blood, are still found in the first death condition are now cast, body and soul, out of that condition, which is abolished, into the *second death!* The difference between the first death and second is essential. The first is through the sin of the first man, in whom we all sinned, and from whom, as a root, we have sprung in sin, and are amenable to God's wrath; but as the subjects of God's grace, it is not necessarily eternal. Out of this, all who believe are delivered and receive life in Christ risen. The second death is not through the sin of Adam, not inherited, but it is the doom of Christ Jesus, the Second Man, the Judge of all, for wilful rebellion against the grace of God and *rejection* of HIS LOVE. This second death is still existence in outer darkness, in wailing and gnashing of teeth. Thus saith the Scripture, and we bow to the word of God.

But our friend again says, the Son of God must destroy all the works of the devil. This he does completely by dissolving and purifying by fire this present heavens and earth, where Satan has accomplished all his dirty work, and which he has so defiled with sin, and by finally driving him and all his seed into outer darkness to be no more seen, far from the eternal day of God in the new heavens and earth! Again he argues, from Rom. v., that as by the offence of *one* the many are dead (yet existing), so also the gift by grace hath abounded unto *many* by One Man, Jesus Christ. Granted; all *in* Adam have died and are dead in sin, so all *in* Christ are alive and righteous *in* him, and it is still the *one* and the *many in* the *one:* thus Adam is the type of him who was to come. The *many* must be in the *one.* We are all in the first man by nature; we come into the second by grace through faith, and are thus born again. "As by the offence of *one man*, judgment came unto *all men* unto condemnation; so by the righteousness of *one*, the free gift came unto *all men* unto justification of life." But if men refuse this grace, and judge themselves unworthy of eternal life, what then? Why, they remain in sin and death. But our friend says again, "Is it not said (Eph. i. 9), that God will gather together in one all things in Christ?" No, not in one, but that he will head up together in Christ all things that are in heaven and in earth. But those who are out

Digitized by Google

in the lake of fire are not said to be in the new heavens and earth. They are most likely in the lake in the centre of this globe, and shall never see the light of life and glory. And surely those who are thus finally subdued and judged, sent into the *second death* (remember it is not the second death that is abolished; it is the first death and the separate state of souls, when the soul and body united are cast into the lake of fire), shall not be found any more in the heavens and earth where God is All in All!

Everlasting God, everlasting life, everlasting salvation, everlasting redemption, everlasting covenant, everlasting consolation, everlasting inheritance; what do they mean if everlasting torment, everlasting fire, everlasting chains, everlasting destruction, everlasting judgments, mean simply annihilation? All the everlastings expressed by one Greek word (*αἰώνιος*).

Here I shall stop, nor dare to follow my friend into the flesh; for here I feel myself in the presence of the liar from the beginning, and the father of lies, telling me not to go by what God has said, but what my judgment might consider he ought to have said. The Holy Ghost rebuking me by the apostle: "Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?"

It is a vain thing to reason or reply against God! God will be justified in all his doings, and overcome when he is judged!

How came all this evil? We are told, as far as concerns us: By one man sin entered the world, and death by sin. How Satan fell we know not, except through pride—that he seduced the one man in whom we all sinned and died. By MAN, the MAN CHRIST JESUS, has come our redemption, with the gift of righteousness and life. We, the children of wrath by nature (not wrath against man, but against all unrighteousness of man), receiving Christ by faith, become new creatures, sons and heirs of God; while those of us who reject this grace of love, the wrath of God remaineth on them and their unrighteousness. Thus remaining in their sin, they go into the second death and shall never see life, which is in the presence of God. These, knowing the righteous judgment of God upon sin, wilfully abiding in their unbelief, must be banished for ever from his presence, as it is written in Rom. ii.: "God will render unto every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honour, and immortality, eternal life; but unto them who are contentious, and obey not the truth but unrighteousness, indignation, and wrath: tribulation and anguish upon every soul that doeth evil; but glory, honour, and peace upon every soul that worketh good." Who those are whom our Lord Jesus, the judge of all, may account good, as to their intentions, their acknowledgment of their own sin and impotence, and their sincerely seeking from God glory and immortality, according to their knowledge of him from his works of creation, and in providence even his eternal power, and Godhead mercies, it is not for us to know. He has taken away the sin of the world, and has life in himself as the Son of Man. All who are not found in the Lamb's book of life are cast into the lake of fire, where is tribulation and anguish; while those who pass into the new heavens and earth have glory, honour, and immortality.

Digitized by Google

Man, originally in innocence a living soul, became through sin mortal. Man as mortal in his sin, receiving Christ by faith, receives immortality; while rejecting this gift of grace he remaineth mortal for ever under wrath, as far as we have now any revelation from God, and this is the second death. Amen.

Torquay. LEONARD STRONG.

REJOINDER.

HAVING been invited by the Editor of the *Rainbow* to append a brief rejoinder to the preceding animadversions on my paper on Immortality, which appeared in the March number, I willingly avail myself of the permission; though at the same time I feel persuaded that no unprejudiced reader will be of opinion that the arguments adduced in that paper have been fairly met, or even materially weakened, by Mr. Strong's remarks. I shall not, however, attempt to follow my censor step by step, through the irrelevant theologising and unsubstantiated assertion in which he has indulged; but content myself with noticing what has at least the semblance of argument, and pointing out one or two instances in which Mr. Strong has, I doubt not very unintentionally, perverted my meaning.

In the first place, when Mr. Strong asserts that I 'think I have discovered . . . . that there is no eternal punishment, no eternal fire,' the statement requires some qualification. It must on the one hand be understood that I by no means doubt the solemn fact, revealed as plainly as anything in Scripture, that there is such a thing as future suffering—suffering, in some cases at least, of awful severity and undefined duration. And on the other hand, that while I deny that the Scriptures, fairly interpreted, contain the frightful dogma of eternal *torment*, I believe as firmly in *eternal punishment*—in the sense of eternal privation and excision—as my opponent himself. This will also suffice as my answer to Mr. Strong's subsequent remark: "I maintain from Scripture, there is no mention of any wicked man passing out of existence, although swept away in judgment from the face of the earth. All must stand up in body and soul before the white throne, and all receive their final doom in body and soul." Well, I have said nothing to the contrary. I have nowhere asserted that any child of Adam passes out of existence previous to the judgment of the great white throne. I have nowhere denied the revealed truth, that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just *and unjust*." And as for any 'censure of the heathen philosophers for *supposing* the existence of men after the death of their bodies, and inventing the word Tartarus,' it exists solely in Mr. Strong's imagination. The only mention of Tartarus in my paper, occurs in an extract from Mr. Constable's essay, and the convenient identification of the Platonic doctrine of the eternal existence of the soul, past as well as future, there alluded to, with a 'belief in the existence of men after the death of their bodies,' is hardly creditable to a Christian controversialist.

Digitized by Google

To pass on: Mr. Strong thinks it is to be regretted that when I was led to bring the popular belief in the eternal duration of evil to the test of Scripture, I did not allow my thoughts to carry me back a little further, namely, to the original permission of evil; and endeavour to fathom that mystery also. To this it might suffice to reply that, whereas the 'mystery' in the one case is real, in the other it is only suppositive. That evil does actually exist is a fact which, however mysterious, cannot be questioned; but that it must and will necessarily exist to all eternity, is an inference which the Scriptures, as I read them, in nowise sanction. The objection, nevertheless, is a plausible one, and as it has been urged by much greater men than Mr. Strong, it may be worth while to consider it for a moment. Stated in the briefest form, it stands thus: "Seeing that God's goodness does permit so much evil to exist at present, may it not also permit still greater evil to exist through eternal ages?" I answer, that the premiss is by no means equal to the conclusion. Because God, not only without impeachment, but to the transcendent manifestation of his divine goodness, permitted his only begotten Son to endure the temporary agony of the cross, it by no means follows that his goodness would have remained unimpeachable had he (*horresco referens*) permitted the Son of his love to endure that agony *to all eternity!* As a means to an end, the sufferings of Christ were not only consistent with, but most gloriously manifested, the divine wisdom and love; and, in like manner, the temporal existence of evil, also as a means to an end, is quite consistent with those divine attributes; whereas its supposed eternal existence—which would make it an end as well as a means—cannot possibly be shown to be so. I do not, of course, intend to say that the recognition of its non-eternity completely solves the original mystery of the existence of evil; but I do unhesitatingly assert that it at least plucks the heart out of it. For, not only does it eliminate the portentous element of *infinity*, but it at the same time reduces it, in a great measure, from a moral to an intellectual difficulty. In a word, evil is to be regarded not as an end, but as the means employed by God for the attainment of an end, and only by a perfect acquaintance with the greatness and blessedness of that end can we justly estimate the wisdom and fitness of the means employed. It is no reflection on the skill of the human architect of some magnificent building, that *during its erection* he should find it expedient to use an unsightly scaffolding; but if, when the building was completed, it were found impossible to dispense with the scaffolding, would it not remain a monument of the architect's incapacity? In like manner, while the temporary permission of evil is at least conceivable, its supposed eternal existence is an insoluble problem.

The next point which it seems well to notice, is Mr. Strong's unhesitating assertion, "That death nowhere in the word of God means non-existence, but everywhere means a certain condition of existence." This somewhat bold statement raises the important and long-debated question, 'What was the death threatened to and incurred by Adam?' In proceeding to answer it, I must first enquire, Whence was the literal and proper idea of death originally derived? *Beyond all doubt, it was from the death of the lower animals.* Science teaches us that many ages before the appearing of man upon this planet, death was the condition of animal existence, and the death of the inferior animals, a phenomenon with which he was acquainted, was the only kind of death of which Adam could have any

Digitized by Google

conception. When, therefore, he was told, "In the day that thou eatest of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, dying thou shalt die," he must necessarily have understood the punishment threatened to be death such as befell the lower animals; in other words, the extinction of his creaturely existence; and if this be not what was really intended, then the terms of the threatening were calculated only to deceive him—a supposition altogether repugnant to our ideas of the divine veracity and benevolence. The death, therefore, which Adam was threatened with, in case of disobedience, and which he actually incurred, was death in the proper and ordinary acceptation of the word; that is, the absolute termination of that creaturely existence which God, at his creation, had conferred upon him. The only distinction between death in the case of man, and death in the case of the mere animal, being that, while the animal dies once for all, the death of the body involving the termination of its existence, man dies by a double death, the first affecting only the body, but the second involving the extinction of the entire being. And this distinction, which, important as it is, does not at all affect the true definition of death, is only in necessary accordance with the peculiar constitution of man's nature. Had man possessed a *merely* animal existence, death would have been to him precisely what it is to any of the lower animals; but inasmuch as his nature was created *tripartite*, consisting of body, soul, and spirit (1 Thess. v. 23); and not, like the lower animals, *duplex*, consisting of soul and body (Gen. i. 30, *margin*), it follows of necessity that death in his case, in order to be final and entire, involves, not only that separation of the soul from the body, which constitutes death in the mere animal, but also the further separation of the soul from the spirit,* which latter might, of course, as in fact it does, constitute a subsequent stage in the process of his dissolution.

I do not for a moment intend to deny that the word *death* is sometimes in the Scriptures used metaphorically; but because it is so used it by no means follows that it has not a true and well-defined literal signification. Such a supposition is absurd in the extreme. It is, on the contrary, just on account of the plainness of its literal meaning that such a figurative use of the word becomes possible. The literal fact is ever the substance of which the metaphor is the projected shadow; and without the former the latter could not be perceived. But adhering to the only sound canon of Scripture interpretation—the literal sense whenever possible—we are bound to accept this, as every other term, literally, unless to do so involves contradiction or absurdity. Suppose I were to say, If you wish to *enrich* your mind, you must *dig* deep into the *mines* of literature—what would you say to the man who upon reading this sentence should say that there was no such thing as material *riches*, no such action as *digging*, and not a literal *mine* in the bowels of the earth? You would certainly set him down as a fool who was not worth listening to, for how could such language be used unless based on literal facts? Yet this is the very line of argument adopted by my opponent.

Passing over a good deal of what I have characterised, I think not unfairly, as irrelevant theologising, I come to this curious statement: "I

* The soul, which man has in common with the brute, would perish with the body, but for the spirit. It is the spirit which sustains the soul's consciousness after death, and supported by it, it arrests that dissolution to which it would otherwise tend."—*Heard's Tripartite Nature of Man*, p. 177.

Digitized by Google

fully grant that the word immortal soul, if it would imply that it was not morally dead, is a wrong one, but if it be used as incorruptible, in contrast to the body, it is correct. It should be translated incorruptible soul, for corruption is always applied to the body." Now I should be glad to know *where* the words "immortal soul" should be translated "incorruptible soul," seeing that neither expression is once found in the Bible. We no more read of *incorruptible* souls than of *immortal*, and it even so happens that in the New Testament the Greek word (ἀφθαρτος) is rigidly confined to those *in Christ*, and especially to their bodies, (1 Cor. xv. 52, 53.) Equally unfortunate is the attempt to employ the *reductio ad absurdum* in reference to my quotation of 1 John v. 12. It by no means follows that because "he that hath not the Son of God hath not THE LIFE (τὴν ζωήν) he is, therefore, in this world, non-existent, or annihilated, *in regard to his mortal Adamic nature.* Death cannot consist with existence so far as the special kind of existence which is in question is concerned; but we must not confound life in Christ and life in Adam. The natural man *is non-existent so far as the life of immortality is concerned,* and in the recognition of this solemn fact we find the key to such passages as John iii. 36; v. 25; Eph. ii. 1; Col. ii. 13. But the natural man is not *as yet* deprived of his Adamic life, though he will be, unless quickened by the Spirit, in the *second death.*

Further on, Mr. Strong writes, "Our Lord, when he died under judgment and wrath for our sins, was verily dead, but *never out of existence (of course I mean as man).*" I am not prepared to grant this in the sense intended. We stand here on the brink of a great and divine mystery. If the punishment threatened to, and incurred by, Adam was, as I have shown, the termination of his existence as a human being, and *if that punishment was really borne by Christ,* then I see not how we are to escape the conclusion that the death of Christ involved nothing less than the separation (for how long or how short a time I venture not to enquire), of his human soul from his human spirit, as well as of both of these from his human body.* In the light of this thought how significant and *definite* becomes the Messianic language of the Psalms. "I am counted with them that go down into the pit; I am as a man that hath no strength; free among the dead, like the slain that lie in the grave, whom thou rememberest no more, and they are cut off by thy hand. Thou hast laid me in the lowest pit, in darkness, in the deeps. Thy wrath lieth hard upon me, and thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves." (Psa. lxxxviii. 4—7.) "Save me, O God, for the waters are come in unto my soul. I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing; I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me. . . . . Deliver me out of the mire, and let me not sink; let me be delivered from them that hate me, and out of the deep waters. Let not the waterflood overflow me, neither let the deep swallow me up, and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me." (Psa. lxix. 1, 2, 14, 15.) So, in the gospels: "And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then said he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death; tarry ye

* The great German commentator *Oldshausen* not only holds that there was such a separation of our Lord's soul and spirit, but that they were only re-united in the resurrection. See *Biblical Commentary on the Gospels.*

Digitized by Google

here, and watch with me. And he went a little farther, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt. . . . . And being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground." (Matt. xxvi. 37—39; Luke xxii. 44.) In connection with these solemn passages, Heb. v. 7, demands our earnest attention: "Who, in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him *out of death* (ἐκ θανατου), and was heard in that he feared." What means this strange and awful agony? What object had these prayers and supplications? That Christ so prayed to be delivered from the mere act of physical death, which many a martyr has borne with unflinching fortitude, cannot be supposed. These passages taken together, and considered in connection with the divine personality of the Lord Jesus, convey the idea of an anguish such as no mere man ever yet endured, and such as into the heart of any mere man it has never yet entered thoroughly to comprehend. And while it is easy and orthodox to say that it was the hiding of his Father's countenance which thus appalled him, it is plain from the last quoted passage that what Christ really prayed to be saved out of was *death*, not simply wrath; yet not the death of the body alone, for in that, if he prayed concerning *it*, he was not heard. But it may be said, if this be indeed the sense in which we are to understand the nature of Christ's atoning death; if his humanity was thus —even for a moment—utterly dissolved and broken up; then, awful thought! Christ has perished, his personal identity has come to an end, and the dark waters of death have indeed gone over his soul! No: for here the grand fundamental doctrine of the incarnation comes in. That this must indeed have been the case had Christ been a mere man is perfectly true; but, be it ever remembered, he was God as well as man; the personality appertained to the divine nature, not to the human, and, therefore, though the union between the elements—body, soul, and spirit—of his most true humanity was suspended, the union between each one of those elements and his divine nature never was, the divine nature constituting a still abiding, all comprehending element, in which they were held together, and in which they were reunited for ever. And thus, in a far deeper and truer sense than Mr. Strong contemplates, was the soul-man brought to nought in the death of Christ, and we are new created, begotten again into a new life by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

But these remarks cannot be prolonged. Mr. Strong's assertion that such expressions as, "He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." "Men gather them (the withered branches) and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." "These, as natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed . . . . . shall utterly perish in their own corruption" (2 Peter ii. 12); &c., as applied to the wicked, "every one respects the destruction of their persons here in their bodies," is one which he not only does not and cannot prove, but also one which is utterly opposed to his own principles of interpretation; for if the *unquenchable fire* in which the chaff is *burnt up* signifies only the temporal death of the body, why should the *unquenchable fire* of Mark ix. 43—48, denote the eternal torment of the soul? Equally in vain is it for Mr. Strong to ring the changes on the words 'ever' and 'everlasting,' or rather 'age' and

Digitized by Google

'age-lasting,' unless he is prepared to show that the general definition of these terms given by Dr. Sidney Smith is not in accordance with the usage of the Greek language. That there are a small class of passages (they do not exceed half a dozen), which, if they stood alone, would go far to establish the dogma of eternal torment, I have fully admitted in my paper, but I have at the same time given abundant proof that they cannot fairly be so taken, but must be interpreted in harmony with other classes of passages, and with the fact, which my opponent does not touch, that man is not by nature an immortal being. Two or three of the passages quoted by Mr. Strong I think it well briefly to notice. As regards the phrase "salted with fire" in Mark ix. 49, it is plain from the whole context that it does not refer to the punishment of the lost at all, but to that "fiery trial" wherewith God tries his own people. Hence it is paraphrased by Dr. David Brown (who himself strongly maintains the popular doctrine,) thus: "Every disciple of mine shall have a fiery trial to undergo, and every one who would be found an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable to God, must have such a *salting*, like the Levitical sacrifices." "The interpretation of the sacrifice as the *condemned*—and the fire and salt as *eternal fire*," says Dean Alford, is *contrary to the whole symbolism of Scripture*, and to the exhortation with which the fiftieth verse ends."

Mr. Strong evidently thinks that he makes a point in reference to Rev. xx. 10, when he directs attention to the fact that "the beast and the false prophet," cast into the lake of fire before the commencement of the millennium (Rev. xix. 20), are spoken of as being still in it at the close of the thousand years, when the devil is also cast therein; and argues from thence that the "second death" cannot be "annihilation." There is really something like an argument here, but the difficulty suggested can be fairly met. Let us look at the analogy of the first death. All men die, indeed, but under what widely different circumstances do they die! One falls asleep as calmly as an infant; another is racked with agony for months and years, till the burden of existence becomes intolerable. A like distinction we learn from this passage, and I think from others, will exist in the 'second death,' and my doctrine allows ample scope for it: "To some this death may be an instantaneous process, a momentary transition from one state to another, like the infant who opens his eyes on this world, and then closes them for ever. . . . . To others, the process of the second death may be more or less lengthened until we arrive at the case of the greatest human offenders, or that more aggravated one of the spirits who fell from heaven, and drew weaker man along with them in their fall. In our theory we see how it may be, as it certainly will be, more tolerable for some than for others in the day of judgment; how, while stripes, many and sore, fall on some, on others they may fall so few and light as scarcely to be felt at all. . . . . The last being that retains the misery of existence may be that arch-fiend Satan, the leader of heaven's rebellion, the prime mover in earth's falling away. When the lost race of man has long ceased to feel—when his fellow angels have, one by one, been reduced to the state of death—he may still survive, longing for the time when he too may lay aside a life which is only one of pain.*

As regards my opponent's mode of dealing with those grand passages

* Rev. H. Constable, Future Punishment, pp. 27—35.

Digitized by Google

which so plainly assert the final deliverance of God's creation from all sin and sorrow, the matter simply amounts to this: that while such texts as appear to teach the hideous dogma of eternal torment are to be interpreted in the largest, most literal, and most offensive sense; such texts as, quite as strongly, teach this worthy and blessed consummation of the Creator's work, are to be explained, softened down, frittered away, lest, haply, they should be found to quench the fiery glories of an eternal hell. I must content myself with noticing only one specimen of Mr. Strong's exegesis, and its results. In reference to the sublime declaration of Rev. xxi. 1—5, that, in the new heavens and new earth, there shall be "no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain (nor "curse," xxii. 3), because the former things have passed away, and all things are made new," he asserts that, while this will be true as far as the redeemed are concerned, the lost are nevertheless to be consigned to eternal torments in the lake of fire "in the centre of this globe." In other words, while the text distinctly declares that, in the 'new earth,' there shall be no more death, Mr. Strong asserts that *within it* death, in its most terrific form, shall eternally reign; while the text declares that there shall be no more pain, Mr. Strong holds that there will be eternal torment; and while the promise of the text is that there shall be "neither sorrow nor crying," Mr. Strong presumptuously asserts that there shall be unending "weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth." Oh, but all this is to be covered up, and kept decently out of sight! As the murderer hides away the damning evidence of his guilt, so God is to hide away the terrible results of his sublime experiment in moral government from the eyes of his shuddering universe. But no, even this miserable relief cannot be conceded; for if in every other particular the language of Rev. xiv. 10, 11, is to be literally interpreted, so also must this, that those cast into the lake of fire are to be tormented for ever and ever "*in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb.*" Never can the eyes of the redeemed be averted from the spectacle of their appalling misery; never shall the ears of the redeemed be closed to the hearing of their lamentable groans: the smoke of their torment will for ever and ever darken the new heavens, and their yells of agony to all eternity mingle with the music of celestial harps. *Can it be true?* And if it be, is not this a heaven only less to be dreaded than the fiery pit itself? But enough. With the moral argument Mr. Strong, very prudently, will have nothing to do. He simply casts dust into the air, and cries out—"The flesh! The flesh!" That is to say, in plain language, he dares not interrogate that moral consciousness—those innate convictions of truth and righteousness—which GOD (not the devil, as my opponent seems to imagine), has implanted in his spirit; because he knows what the response would surely be. Yet let him remember that the very apostle whose words he quotes, was not afraid to make such an appeal (Rom. iii. 4—6); and that when Abraham, in his sublime expostulation in behalf of the righteous inhabitants of Sodom, took upon himself to say to the Almighty, "That be far from thee to do after this manner, *Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?*" the patriarch's appeal to his own moral consciousness was not only allowed by the Lord, but received from him the most gracious answer.

Two facts I must in conclusion point out to the reader: (1.) Mr. Strong has not adduced one tittle of independent and legitimate evidence in proof

Digitized by Google

of the natural immortality of man. (2.) He has, to his credit, throughout his paper, fairly admitted that immortality only in Christ *is* the doctrine of Scripture. The Jachin and Boaz of my theory, therefore, stand erect and firm; the blessed hope which it lights up remains unextinguished. *Amen and Amen.*

Birkenhead. W. MAUDE.

HELL:

REGARDED AS A PLACE WHERE IT IS "GOOD" BUT NOT "HONOURABLE" TO BE.*

OUR readers will probably think that we are jesting. Who, outside of Bedlam, they will ask, ever imagined, far less gravely propounded to the Christian public, a theory such as the above? We are not jesting. We could not jest upon such a theme. This theory *has* been propounded by a man out of Bedlam, by the Incumbent of a parish in the University Town of Cambridge, by the Rev. T. R. Birks, the oracle of the evangelical party in the church of England, one of the secretaries of the great Evangelical Alliance! If you doubt our word turn to pp. 194—5 of his work on "The Victory of Divine Goodness." He is commenting on Matt. xxvi. 24, where Christ pronounces the awful doom of Judas. For the authorised version he would substitute, "it had been *honourable* for that man if he had not been born." He holds that it was "*good*" for Judas to have been born and to go to his own place, the depth of hell, but that it was not an *honourable* position for him to occupy in creation. What he says of the traitor he says also of all "lost souls." He grounds his correction of our version upon a supposed difference of meaning between two Greek words, καλὸν and ἀγαθόν. This difference, we suppose exists in Mr. Birks's brain, but it does not exist in classical dictionaries. καλὸς, says Liddell and Scott's Dictionary, is "much like ἀγαθός," and we suppose Liddell and Scott are higher authorities on the sense of a Greek term than the Incumbent of Holy Trinity.

Look to it, gentlemen of the evangelical party and the evangelical alliance. We have been accustomed to regard you as upholders of the good old orthodox doctrine of Augustine and Tertullian, who certainly do not describe hell as a place where it is good to be. You probably also regard yourselves as genuine followers of those ancient fathers, whose hell is pictured in the poetry of Dante, Milton, and Pollok. If so, beware of where you are being led. Distrust the prophet who has undertaken to be your guide. To us he appears to wear a disguise. The hands may be like Esau's hands, but surely the voice is Jacob's! We do not see *Augustine* leading your horses' bridles; if we are not greatly mistaken that guileful guide is *Origen*. To us you appear like the bands of Syria "smitten with blindness." Open your eyes, or you will find yourselves, not in Dothan, but in Samaria.

* "The Victory of Divine Goodness." By T. R. Birks, M.A., Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Cambridge. Rivingtons, 1867.

Digitized by Google

But in truth we do not know *how* to characterise the theory of Mr. Birks. We have read his book with great attention. We have studied it with every wish to know his exact meaning. We cannot, after all our study, see that it corresponds to any theory that has ever been put forward by any of Homer's "articulate speaking men." Augustine would look upon it with infinite disdain, and probably apportion to its author a place in his genuine hell. Origen would bestow upon it a smile of bland contempt as a poor parody on his own grand idea. If Solomon were alive he would see in it what he had never seen in his limited experience—"a new thing under the sun." It is in fact altogether unique, and we will consider it simply as *the theory of Mr. Birks,* one of the "new unfoldings" which this advocate of the evangelical theory of "development" tells us we are to expect in these latter days (xi. 174).

We will first remark that Mr. Birks holds firmly that theory of the immortality of all souls, which lies at the root of the grand errors on the question of the future of the wicked. Like a great many other modern advocates of this figment, he distrusts all the natural arguments which used to be unhesitatingly relied on. (pp. 53—4.) What Plato, Tertullian, and Augustine, put forward as substantial reasons for man's belief in his essential immortality, Mr. Birks characterises justly as "abstract reasoning which soars into regions where the air is almost too thin to sustain life." His reliance for this belief is on "the word of God," though where in that word immortality is promised to "lost souls" we do not know, nor does he tell us. However, he believes, with or without reason, with or without Scripture, that the life which God once gave he will never withdraw either from fallen men or fallen angels. Somewhere and in some condition they will all continue to exist as long as good angels and redeemed saints exist, yea, as long as God himself continues to have being. (pp. 157, 185, 25.) So far he agrees in principle with Origen and Augustine.

In his locality of lost souls he is correct. It is hell—the Gehenna of Scripture. He here departs from the theory of Origen. Origen rescues them from hell. Mr. Birks leaves them there during their endless life. So far in words he agrees with Augustine.

But what is Hell? What is its condition? What is its origin and its source? It is according to Mr. Birks—"a work of redemption," "a triumph of redeeming goodness!" (p. 171.) The death of Christ, he holds, was endured for every individual of the human race. Some, in this day of grace on earth, avail themselves of the offers of salvation, and are brought, through their Redeemer's atonement, to the state of glory. But even for those who here wilfully refuse all God's offers, and do despite to the Spirit of grace, the atoning work of Christ procures blessings of an incalculable nature in the world to come. It delivers them from the "curse of the law," from the "*first death*" which would otherwise have been the penalty of sin. This first death, according to Mr. Birks, consisted in the physical corruption of man's body, in "moral corruption, degrading, perverting, desecrating, all the faculties and powers of the immortal spirit." (p. 157.) *If unredeemed* there would have been for mankind, "through ages without end, the awful reality of a God-dishonouring, God-hating, God-blaspheming, self-tormenting, God-abandoned universe." (pp. 157, 8.) *Nothing but the atonement,* he tell us, could deliver from this

Digitized by Google

fearful curse; but it has delivered, and will deliver all men from it, whether it was itself "believed or disbelieved." (p. 165.) Man's conduct or faith makes no difference here. This first and most terrible death is removed from all men because, and only because, Christ died for all men. But because he did truly, really, efficaciously, die for all men, therefore no man shall suffer this first death.

But how are they delivered from it? In the case of believers they are delivered by the glorious resurrection of the body, by its reunion to the redeemed spirit, and the eternal life of full blessedness. In the case of unbelievers and ungodly men, they are delivered by the resurrection of the body in shame and contempt, its reunion to the spirit, and their eternal life in hell. This life in hell, whose condition and nature we will consider farther on, is called by Mr. Birks the second death. (pp. 168, 188.) What we have now particularly to consider is that Mr. Birks makes this second death in hell to be a blessed result of Christ's atonement, and one *which would not, and which could not be obtained save through that atonement alone.* (pp. 157, 165).

But Mr. Birks himself with a ruthless, though probably an unconscious hand, throws down the strange theory he built up with so much painful ingenuity. "The curse of the law" he tells us frequently and with truth, "*can be removed by the atonement alone.*" (p. 165). This curse, let us remember, is the first death. He also tells us truly that "*fallen angels are wholly beyond the redemption of Christ.*" (p. 152.) The natural and logical inference from this would be that fallen angels would be left to the worst consequences of a sin which had not been atoned for, and could on no account obtain the rather equivocal blessing of that second death in hell which is, according to Mr. Birks, one of the fruits of Christ's redemption. (p. 171.) Mr. Birks, however, to whom the silence of Scripture is an eloquent voice, to whose prophetic glance are open "the deep analogies which lie below its surface," and to whose "meditation" truths hidden "below that surface" become "revealed" (pp. 48, 173), does not draw those inferences from plain overground truths which more ordinary men would do. Fallen angels, according to him, do not suffer the penalty of sin; fallen angels, according to him, share in the blessing of the second death, though they occupy in it a yet less "honourable" position than the lost souls of men. (p. 176). But from hence Mr. Birks must allow us to say, he himself leads us to the inevitable conclusion that the second death is *not* one of the blessed consequences of redemption, *since fallen angels, who are unredeemed, obtain it as their lot.* And so falls down this portion of Mr. Birks's building, thrown down by the hands of the architect himself.

But Mr. Birks has elsewhere given another deadly blow to his own theory. He has, as we have seen, described the first death as a most fearful thing. It was the death threatened to Adam when God said, "In the day thou eatest thou shalt surely die." All the terrible circumstances which Augustine attributes to the second death are by our author ascribed to the first. They are, indeed, terrible beyond imagination. *But their very terribleness is their destruction.* Mr. Birks looks at his horrid picture and pronounces it the nightmare of a fevered mind. Mr. Birks gazes at the ghastly phantom as it rises up from the depths at his bidding, and in very terror he pronounces it a ghastly phantom of the brain. After describing it to us till our heart grew sick, after telling us that it is the wages of

Digitized by Google

sin and its "due desert, the issue to which it naturally tends" (158), he finishes by telling us that it was a thing so terrible, so horrible, so contrary to every attribute of God, that it could not under any circumstances or by any possibility whatsoever *be permitted to continue in any part of God's world!* "It may be borne with for a time," he says, "but its *continuance would be fatal to the dominion and glory of the Most High.*" (p. 178.)

And now what comes of all his theory, that the first death was removed by the free grace of God, out of his own will and bounty providing a Saviour from it? Why, according to Mr. Birks's last announcement, *God's free grace was an act of pure necessity.* If God would not see himself hurled from his throne, if God would not see his glory covered with eternal darkness and shame, he must, according to Mr. Birks, abolish this first death which he had so inconsiderately threatened! It was a thing which could not be endured: it was a thing which could not continue: it was a thing which must be put an end to. Whatever were the means, they *must* be put into operation to destroy the enemy, which, undestroyed, would destroy the throne of God. If Christ's work of atonement was the *only* means of abolishing this first death, then Christ's work of atonement was not an act of grace for the sinner, but an act of necessity for God, and by the very same necessity that it was wrought for sinful man, must it have been wrought for fallen angels. Such is Mr. Birks's theory!

Again we tell you gentlemen of the Augustinian theology, look to your "guide, philosopher, *friend.*" What he pictures as belonging to the first death, you all, from your inmost hearts, and in the full convictions of your understandings, agree in attributing to the second. "A God-dishonouring, God-hating, God-blaspheming, self-tormenting, God-abandoned" world is with you "the awful reality" of all souls condemned in the judgment (157). And this "awful reality" you believe heartily will continue while songs of praise are heard in heaven, and God opens his ears to their sound. Mr. Birks honestly tells you that you are in a deadly error. He tells you that you are maintaining opinions which are undermining the throne of God, and covering his glory with shame. And, what is more, he is telling you the honest truth. We merely ask you, do you hold his sentiments? Most certainly he loathes, detests, and condemns what are supposed to be yours.

But we will here appeal to Mr. Birks himself. If we have spoken in terms of unmeasured severity of his theory on the particular question before us, it is not that we are blind to his real ability when he enunciates it upon worthy subjects. In his view of hell, he has chosen to maintain a thesis which the ingenuity of Thomas Aquinas, the boldness of Luther, and the reasoning of Butler, could not maintain. He has elsewhere shown that he can handle a difficult subject with clearness, boldness, originality, and truth. To such a mind we put it, whether his view of the first death is for a moment tenable? Are the "*due desert of sin, its natural issue, its harvest*" (158), a consummation which would be "fatal to the dominion and glory of the Most High"? (178.) Are God and nature at this deadly strife? Is not nature, in all her workings, the ordinance and product of the divine mind? Are they not, then, at one? *Could* any "natural issue," any punishment which was the offender's "due desert," if allowed to proceed to its legitimate and proper end, overthrow the throne of the God of nature, cover his glory with shame? Far be it from us to entertain

Digitized by Google

such an *atheistic notion.* The sinner *might* endure the wages of sin, its deadly issue *might* be allowed to take place, and so far from God's throne being shaken, or his glory obscured, it would be but the establishment of both throne and glory. And again, we would ask Mr. Birks, is it for one moment to be said of God that *he threatened what he could not, would not, must not execute?* He threatened man with the first death, when he said, "In the day thou eatest thou shalt surely die." Could this be a punishment which it was out of God's power to inflict unless he would overturn his own throne, and hide his glory under shame? Most assuredly not. God never held out a threat which it would be unjust or impossible for him to fulfil. He does not play with weapons that he is afraid to use, or bandy threats which he would shrink from executing. This is the part of the timid child, of the weak-minded ruler, not of the great wise Governor of an infinite world. Adam could not say to God, "You cannot put in force this penalty you speak of." Nor could angels smile aside as they heard the new creature placed under sanctions the putting of which into force would overthrow the throne of the universe. We put it, therefore, to Mr. Birks, that the first death was not such a thing as he has described. Let him only allow *death to be death,* and his perplexities will come to an end. He allows that a state of things so monstrous *could not be borne with*: his only legitimate inference is, that it was never contemplated by God when he spoke to man of death as the penalty of sin.

But if Mr. Birks had not himself thrown down his own building as soon as he had raised it, Scripture would have overturned it. Mr. Birks has described the first death as the penalty of the sin which has no redemption, and the second death as the penalty of the sin for which atonement has been made. (169—171.) *Scripture teaches the exact converse of this.* The everlasting fire of hell, which is the second death, it tells us *was prepared first as the punishment of those fallen angels for whom there was no redemption.* (Matt. xxv. 41.) The second death, then, is not a punishment for those who have atonement made for their sin, but for those who had not. It is not a work of redemption: it is a work planned and prepared before man was created, or had sinned, or had the promise of redemption. Mr. Birks may, perhaps, have some "deep analogy," some "revealed truth beneath the surface," to set in opposition to the assertion of Scripture; but as we are unable to perceive his "deep analogies," or to see what is "below the surface," and do not recognise in Mr. Birks a power of spiritual vision which no other man possesses, we prefer to abide by what the word of God has plainly told us of the matter. Again, the first death is a penalty for those whose fall and whose redemption had been foreseen and provided for before they sinned, and was therefore, doubtless, so planned as to be consistent with the provided redemption. We will not call it a work of redemption, which to us appears an absurd name for a penalty enacted for transgression, but it was a work of judgment on those who were to be redeemed. We would, therefore, with reason, suppose it a punishment of a kind inferior to that of the second death. And this exactly suits the apparent justice of the case. The sin of angels was greater than that of man, and therefore the punishment of angels would properly be the greater of the two. Our theory exactly suits such a state of things. With us the first death is the death of the body, while the spirit continues to live to reclaim and

Digitized by Google

re-inhabit its body at the glorious resurrection procured by the redemption of Christ: the second death is the destruction of the entire being of all those who shall endure it.

We now come to a most important part of Mr. Birks's theory, namely, *the moral change*, if any, produced in fallen angels and lost souls, in and by that second death of which he speaks. *This is a point of primary importance.* Every one will see what mighty consequences must follow, from whatever view is taken of it. Lost souls enter hell in a state of alienation from God, of impenitence, of dislike for what is holy, of sympathy for what is evil. We want to know from Mr. Birks what change he supposes is produced in them in hell! Do they become penitent as those who have repented upon earth? Is their alienation from God converted into devotion amid the everlasting flames? Do they learn to love all that is good and holy, and to hate all that is evil, amid the "everlasting contempt" to which they have been consigned? Or, does the alienation of their heart continue: and is their impenitency unchanged?

We are sorry to say that Mr. Birks is not very explicit on this point. We should have wished him to speak out more clearly than he has done. We would have expected that if the direct statements of Scripture did not help him, that at least some "deep analogy," or "revealed truth below the surface," would have enabled him to see exactly how things were, and seeing them himself, to make them known to our short sight. Instead of this, we are compelled to scrutinise most accurately every hint he gives, to weigh the force of his silence, to bring together and compare every expression found scattered throughout his volume, in order to arrive at anything like a satisfactory idea of his meaning, if indeed even thus we are able to attain one. We will let our readers know what we gather thus from Mr. Birks's statements. If we are at all inaccurate, we will certainly lay the blame on Mr. Birks's want of clearness, and shall expect him, in some way or other, to let the public know what he really holds and maintains.

The idea, then, which we gather from a patient and minute reading of Mr. Birks's "Victory of Divine Goodness," is, that *he does not consider that any such moral change* as takes place here on earth, in the case of every redeemed soul, *takes place in any souls in hell.* We have not met with any assertion of his that such does happen. We have nowhere heard him say that devils or lost souls learn in hell to love the just Judge who is there everlastingly punishing them, or to mourn in "godly sorrow" for the sin that has brought them there. The Second Birth—Repentance—Conversion—Quickening with Christ—Renewing by the Spirit—expressions so constantly used of those who have been brought from sin to God on this earth—Mr. Birks has never once used of the lost souls or fallen angels in hell. We feel satisfied that, if he thought they were at all applicable, he would have applied them. It would not weigh with him that they were not so applied in Scripture, for he has, besides its letter, its "deep analogies," and its concealed truths, to draw freely on. We, therefore, would conclude from his silence that he does not believe that any such moral change is produced in hell. But we have, besides his silence, several expressions of his which lead us to the same conclusion, and satisfy us that we have taken the true view of his silence. He tells us, indeed, that the fearful evil which would flow from what he supposes the first

Digitized by Google

death to be will not be permitted, and could not be permitted to continue. Hell will not exhibit "for ever the *unchecked ravings of fiendish malice, the blasphemous utterances of raging despair.*" The second death is the divine remedy for all that is *most fearful and appalling of possible and actual evil*: "the *worst* malignity of evil" will be overcome. (178, 9.) Now, it will be remarked by the careful reader that Mr. Birks, in these passages, carefully avoids saying that "*all evil*" will be removed by the process of the second death. He leads us only to conclude that its *worst manifestation* will be checked. We see this from other expressions of his. Thus in two passages, he tells us that "*active* rebellion" against God will be abolished." (179.) Elsewhere he tells us that "active malice and *permitted* blasphemies" will not be perpetual: that "*all actings of the rebellious will*" will be abolished. (47.) But he constantly admits throughout that the "*wills*" of lost souls and fallen angels have not been brought into harmony with God. In one place he tells us that "the doom of lost souls involves an *unwilling acknowledgment* of God's justice," and that their perception of "all the other attributes of God," if "real," is also "*compulsory.*" (47, 8.) "*The rebellious creature* will be taught, *in spite of itself*, to take its true place at the footstool of triumphant holiness." (186.) The only evils, in fact, which the second death abolishes effectually are "*pride and falsehood.*" (185.) Fallen angels and lost souls, committed to the eternal prison, overwhelmed in everlasting darkness, have all their old pride crushed and extinguished; and lost souls now see clearly the falsehood of all those old excuses by which craftier spirits lured them onward to endless ruin.

We are unable, we candidly confess, to see any victory of divine goodness over evil in this melancholy picture. We see no real change wrought in any heart of man or of angel. The old alienation is there still, but its outward manifestations, and its active workings, are checked and subdued. Satan no longer walks abroad seeking whom he may devour, but the sullen spirit of rebellion lurks within the heart of the fallen archangel. Lost souls no longer blaspheme aloud the great name of their Judge, but thoughts akin to blasphemy seem to be still busy in the inner workings of their mind. This melancholy congregation of hell seem to us like criminals condemned to perpetual imprisonment, who dare not look defiance, or utter insolence beneath the perpetual watchfulness of a stern gaoler, but who assuredly love not the law which has passed upon them their changeless sentence. Or, they resemble caged wild beasts, which silently pace within their prison bars, their roar for ever silenced, their deadly spring upon their victim impossible, but whose spirit is the very same as when they paced the sands of Africa, or crouched amid the jungles of Hindostan. In this unhappy picture of the place where Mr. Birks thinks it is "good" to be, we see not Origen drawing his bright vision of the future, but rather Augustine painting the scene of blackness of darkness for ever. But, *it is on spirits such as we have seen Mr. Birks to describe lost souls and fallen angels to be*, that their endless future is to work the magical change which is to convert hell into a lower kind of heaven, one of the many mansions, it may be the humblest, of our Father's house! Let us now attend to Mr. Birks's account of the punishment of hell.

He insists that every one of the evil things spoken of in Scripture, and interpreted according to the Augustinian view, falls on lost souls in hell.

Digitized by Google

Their "personal loss and ruin are complete and irreparable, their anguish intense, their shame and sorrow dreadful, their humiliation infinite and irreversible." (48.) Their "doom" is "awful," is "unutterably severe." (181.) Plunged in the "depths of shame," "in the depths of the fiery lake," in hell they find themselves "captive and in chains." (195, 183.) For them is no salvation "from shame and everlasting contempt, from everlasting fire." (191.) Suffering from the fires of penal judgment, from the ceaseless "stroke of the avenger," he describes their "estate" as "most forlorn," their "sorrow" as "unchangeable." (187, 191.) Nor does he hold out the remotest prospect that this state of things will ever have an end. He is here, unmistakably, Augustinian. The "immortal spirit" cannot die. In the ever-burning fires it is to spend its endless life. From the prison it can never go forth—from the chains it never can be free. This "most forlorn estate" is "irreversible and lasting," this state of conscious punishment endures for evermore. (187, 41.)

Our readers will probably say—"*this is Augustine's veritable hell.*" So it is. But Mr. Birks proceeds *to qualify it.* As the painter puts in his dark ground first, and then throws in the lighter colours, so it is with the divine who has undertaken to paint hell as a place where it is "good" to be. Having given us the lurid black colours of Augustine's brush he proceeds to use the softer and more pleasing colours of Origen. The picture, he tells us is *not* "*unrelieved.*" (180.) On the contrary it assumes in Mr. Birks's dissolving process so agreeable an aspect, that it becomes "the object of deep complacency and holy adoration to saints and angels." (180.) The happiness of heaven is positively increased by beholding the contentment and happiness of hell. Those who are surrounded by the everlasting penal fire, also find themselves "encircled evermore with the infinite compassions of him whose name is Love." (194.) Their "unutterable severe doom" they discover to be "a work of mercy," a "work of redemption," and they not merely experience "*an awful and stupendous consolation,*" but begin to understand that after all they are "*unutterably blessed.*" (190, 48.) Under the mysterious influence of this "vision of surpassing love" and "divine compassion" of which they find themselves the recipients in their eternal prison, "the depths of their fiery lake" are "lit up with the brightness of the uncreated light." (192, 194, 196.) Rays of light "break in" on utter darkness, and "rays of comfort" on "unchangeable sorrow." (191.) "Messages of real mercy" come to the lost "world of rebels;" their "lake of fire" they find to their great delight to be "shut in by Emmanuel's land on every side;" and altogether the reflections produced within them "raise their souls into a trance of holy adoration," in which they may well be supposed to forget altogether what is uncomfortable in their situation. (195, 170, 45.) And then the actual amount of the fire in which they find themselves is a matter which they take into consideration. There might be a great deal more of that burning element than there is. It is "*not a sea, an ocean, an abyss of fire*": *it is only "a lake!*" (182.) It did not occur to Mr. Birks that on his own showing the "lake" would appear to be larger than the "abyss," for he has told us very often that the "abyss" is thrown into and swallowed up by the "lake." (195—6.) However, the cubic measure of the fire does not appear to us a matter of much moment.

Even across Mr. Birks's mind, as he was weaving this extraordinary tissue,

Digitized by Google

there would seem to have come unpleasant perceptions that it was, to say the least of it, a very extraordinary and rather hard to be accounted for procedure. It did not seem, even to him, to hang well together. The child of his fruitful fancy had not a natural look. As it grew up into shape, under his careful nursing, its features did not appear to improve. He accordingly, from time to time, throws over its person the drapery of sounding and mysterious language by the aid of which he hopes the cherished one may look somewhat less unnatural in his own and the world's prying eyes. The condition of the lost, he tells us, will be "*a mysterious paradox, an eternal contrast,*" "*a deep mystery.*" (187, 194.) "*The compassion of Christ to the lost,*" in leaving them for ever in an anguish that is intense, is "*wondrous.*" "*Divine love,*" in their case, "*assumes its strangest and most mysterious form.*" They are "*saved in a strange mysterious sense.*" (183, 187, 190, 195.) That word "*mystery*" appears to be the magic term which is to satisfy all our doubts, and remove all our objections, and make us perfectly satisfied that Mr. Birks's theory is a sound reasonable theory, and his child lawfully begotten. In spite, however, of that word "mystery," and all its vast inconceivable meanings on which Mr. Birks so strongly relies, we insist that his paradox is contradiction, and his theory as childish, as nonsensical, as absurd, as was ever attempted to be palmed off by one man upon another. A greater heap of contradictions, a more perplexed maze, a more hopeless obscurity, more illogical nonsense, not to say unscriptural teaching, it has never been our lot to look at.

Let us enquire in what way he supposes his mysterious result to be arrived at. He pictures beings tossing in a lake of fire and yet wrapped in a trance of holy adoration: experiencing at the same moment a doom of unutterable severity and divine compassion: ever meeting with the strokes of an avenger, and the soothings of his stupendous consolation: discovering that they are simultaneously the children of changeless sorrow and unutterable blessedness: dwelling in what is, at the same time, the blackness of darkness for ever, and the brightness of the uncreated light! How does Mr. Birks tell us that this mysterious paradox—to us appearing a most palpable contradiction—is reached? Why, in a manner that adds to our wonder a hundredfold.

Mr. Birks first tells us that the marvellous inner process of thought, which produces a state of feeling in which surpassing sorrow and anguish are, as it were, overlaid, if not quite swallowed up, by an overpassing joy, is brought about by the clear unclouded perception of the "*depths of*" *God's* "*compassion to the self ruined.*" (64.) We know some little of the marvellous power of excited feeling to deaden and destroy even the sense of physical pain, and are, therefore, quite prepared to admit that there might be some such process in hell. The holy martyr, filled with a sense of his Redeemer's love, sustained by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, looking on to the eternal life and joy that surely await him, has borne the violence of fire as though it were the playings around him of the summer breeze. But we ask Mr. Birks to point out to us anything in the remotest degree analogous to this in the case of lost souls, which could, even for a moment, mitigate their anguish. Whence are they to perceive "the depths of compassion" as shown *to them*? What have they around them? A prison—a lake of fire! Whom have they around them? Fellow prisoners as wretched as themselves! Have they any hope in the future? None.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Birks is careful to impress upon us that their doom will never be reversed. (64.) When there *is any* compassion shown to them—far less such an amount of compassion as raises them out of themselves, makes them forget who and what they are, and must continue to be for ever and for ever! Mr. Birks then utterly fails to show how hell can become a place where it is "good" to be from any wonderful exhibition of God's compassion as vouchsafed to the lost. The true compassion would be to let them die.

But, fearful perhaps lest the divine compassion to souls irretrievably lost might not be sufficiently appreciated by them, or be able by itself to change the character and condition of hell, Mr. Birks advances another reason which he would seem to think possessed of greater force. He supposes lost souls not only to know of, but to be actual beholders of, the bliss of the redeemed and of the angelic world. They have before them the sight "of a ransomed universe, and of all the innumerable varieties of blessedness enjoyed by unfallen spirits, and the ransomed people of God." (45.) We suppose it is for this purpose that he tells us that the lake of fire is on every side shut in by Emmanuel's land. (170.) From the midst of this fire they look on the blessed ones in their joy. The sight of others' joy banishes their sorrow. The pure disinterested delight at the aspect of a bliss in which they are never to partake cheats them into a kind of belief that they partake of it; and, if the full joy of the glorified cannot be had, at least universal peace and contentment will dwell evermore in the breasts of lost souls when they think how unutterably happy redeemed souls are! Now was there ever drawn a representation of things more false to nature and to truth than this? Are hungry men fed by the sight of well-spread tables at which others sit? Are sick men cheated out of their agony as they look at ruddy cheeks, and listen to the sound of the laughter of health? Are paupers who know not where to procure the bread for which pale children are crying, lulled into contentment when they see the exhibition of wealth and grandeur? No; *the opposite is the effect.* It is the contrast of poverty and wealth, of misery and grandeur, which produces in human nature envy, and repining, and discontent. It is when those opposite states are closely brought together, when the poor and the wretched, and the outcast, are daily brought into contact with prosperity, that the brow is clouded, and the eye scowls, and the deep mutterings are heard, which are the moral signs of social revolution. Mr. Birks' representation is not true to human nature. The notion of hell in content because heaven is happy is a melodramatic idea, more extravagant and absurd than was ever put upon the boards of a theatre, or drawn by the pen of Dickens in broadest ridicule of the absurdities of the stage; only a subject such as this is not the subject for farce.

It is not thus that the book which describes human nature more faithfully than any, or all other books have done, describes the effect of the strong contrast of two opposite conditions. In the seventy-third Psalm we have a picture of this kind drawn, and its effects, and how these effects are removed. Here the wicked are in prosperity, while the child of God is in adversity. And what is the result? A murmuring and repining on the part of the latter. His feet are almost gone: his footsteps are well nigh slipped. Rebellious, unbelieving thoughts rise up in his mind. When the ungodly prosper and increase in riches, the poor saint thinks that he has

Digitized by Google

cleansed his heart in vain and washed his hands in innocency to little purpose. He has to go into God's sanctuary ere the effect of this painful contrast is removed. Its removal is effected by the assurance that the contrast will not be eternal. The conditions will be eternally reversed. The prosperity of the wicked will vanish as a dream; while God will be the everlasting portion of his child. "*Surely there is an end,*" He saith to the latter, "*and thine expectation shall not be cut off.*" What the people of God, with a glorious eternity before them, can scarcely avoid doing, namely, envying the prosperity of a few fleeting years, Mr. Birks would have us to believe that impenitent souls unwillingly acknowledging the divine attributes, avoid doing in hell; nay, that they are so infinitely superior in moral disinterestedness to the redeemed, that the bare sight of a joy which never can be theirs imparts a share of its joy to them! What matters it to them that they are in everlasting fire, suffering the dire reward of their deeds! Are not the redeemed for ever to enjoy the blessed fruits of their faith and self-denial! Is not that enough for the poor wretches in hell?

It is not thus that any faithful portrayer of nature speaks. Let Mr. Birks turn to the poetry of Milton for a philosophy that is truer than a considerable portion of its theology. Satan has left the realms of punishment where, out of sight of bliss, he almost fancies he "can make a heaven of hell." He has passed through the realms of Chaos, and stood upon our earth in its glorious prime. He looks upon the lower creation in its happiness, but

> "the fiend
> Saw undelighted all delight."

He looks upon man, the image of God, in his unfallen purity.

> "Two of far nobler shape, erect and tall,
> Godlike erect, with native honour clad
> In naked majesty, seemed lords of all,
> And worthy seemed: for in their looks divine
> The image of their glorious Maker shone."

And what are Satan's reflections? Mr. Birks would doubtless have wrapped him in a train of holy adoration at the sight of so much happiness. Milton paints a deeper anguish as visiting his breast, and a desire to effect its ruin:—

> "O hell! What do mine eyes with grief behold,
> Into our room of bliss, thus high advanced,
> Creatures of other mould!"

We have somewhat more to say of the manner in which Mr. Birks endeavours to support his theory, but space forbids our now putting it forward. We hope to do so in the following number of the *Rainbow*. And here we cannot forbear to express our warm sense of the obligation which we and all lovers of truth lie under to the editor. He has given for the discussion of this vital question all we want—a fair field and no favour. At a time when no other periodical would give us room for the examination of a question second to none in importance, he has given us the necessary space. At a time when magazines and newspapers, under colour of reviewing our opinions, were exhibiting with their misrepresentations either gross malice or the densest ignorance, he has enabled us to lay before the public what we really hold and maintain. He did so when, by doing so,

Digitized by Google

he risked the very existence of his periodical. He has borne, what every honest man must be prepared to bear, calumny and loss for the carrying out of his convictions. All honour to Dr. LEASK, the manly editor of the *Rainbow*. We trust, and hope, and believe, that so far from being ultimately an injury, his conduct will place him and his periodical higher in the esteem and support of a truth-loving public.

HENRY CONSTABLE,
Desertmore Glebe. Prebendary of Cork.

THE SECOND ADVENT—CERTAIN AND SUDDEN.

"For the Son of Man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning: lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch."—Mark xiii. 34—37.

THE church on earth is Christ's house. "Who left his house." (Verse 34.) This parable represents the Church on earth as Christ's house or dwelling.

I. Because he is the foundation-stone of it. Just as every stone of a building rests on the foundation, so does every believer rest on Christ. He is the foundation-rock upon which they rest. If it were not for the foundation, the whole house would fall into ruins; the flood and wind would sweep it away. If it were not for Christ, all believers would be swept away; but they are rooted and built up in him, and so they form his house.

II. Because he is the Builder. (1.) Every stone of the building has been placed there by the hand of Christ. Christ has taken every stone from the quarry: "Look unto the rock whence ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye were digged." A natural person is imbedded in the world just as firmly as a rock in the quarry; the hand of the Almighty Saviour alone can dig out the soul and loosen it from its natural state. (2.) Christ has carried it and laid it on the foundation. Even when a stone has been quarried it cannot lift itself; it needs to be carried and built up on the foundation. So when a natural soul has been awakened, he cannot build himself on Christ; he must be carried on the shoulder of the Great Master-builder. Every stone of the building has been thus carried by Christ. What a wonderful building! well may it be called Christ's house, when he built every stone of it. See that ye be quarried out by Christ; see to it that ye be carried by him, built on him; then you will be an habitation of God through the Spirit.

III. Because his friends are here. Wherever a man's friends are, that is his home. Wherever a man's mother, and sister, and brother dwell, that is his home. This, then, must be Christ's home; for he stretched forth his hands towards his disciples and said, "Behold my mother and my brethren; for whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven,

Digitized by Google

the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." As long as this world has a believer in it, Christ will look upon it as his house. He cannot forget, even in glory, the well of Samaria, the garden of Gethsemane, the hill of Calvary. Happy for you who know Christ, and who do the will of his Father; wherever you dwell, Christ calls it his house. You may dwell in a poor place, and still be happy, for Christ dwells with you and calls it his dwelling. He calls you "My brother, sister, mother."

II. Christ is like a man who has gone a far journey. (Verse 34.) Although the Church on earth be his house, and although he has such affection for it, yet Christ is not here. He is risen, Christ is risen indeed.

(1.) He has gone to take possession of heaven in our name. When an elder brother of a family purchases a property for himself and his brothers, he goes a far journey, in order to take possession; so Christ is an elder brother. He lived and died in order to purchase forgiveness and acceptance for sinners. He has gone into heaven, to take possession for us. Do you take Christ for your surety? Then you are already possessed of heaven.

Question. How am I possessed of heaven when I have never been there?

Answer. Christ, your surety, has taken possession in your name. If you will realise this, it will give you fulness of joy. A person may possess a property which he has never seen.

Look at your surety in the land that is very far off, calling it all his own, for the sake of his younger brethren. "These things have I spoken unto you, that your joy may be full."

(2.) He has gone to intercede for us. (1.) He has gone to intercede for unawakened barren sinners. "Lord, let it alone this year also." O sinner! Why is it that you have not died a sudden death? Why have you not gone quite down into the pit? How often the Saviour has prayed for some of you? Shall it be all in vain? (2.) To intercede for his believing people, to procure all blessings for them. Often an elder brother of a family goes into a far country, and sends back rich presents to his younger brethren at home. This is what Christ hath done. He has gone above all heavens, there to appear in the presence of God for us, and to ask the very things we need, and to send us down all the treasures of heaven. Of his fulness have we all received, even grace for grace. "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter." O Christians, believe in a praying Christ if you would receive heavenly blessings. Believe just as if you saw him, and open the mouth wide to receive the blessings for which he is praying.

(3.) He has gone to prepare a place for us. When a family are going to emigrate to a foreign shore, often the elder brother goes to prepare a place for his younger brethren. This is what Christ has done. He does not intend that we should live here always. He has gone a far journey in order to prepare a place for us: "I go to prepare a place for you; and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you to myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." O Christians, believe in Christ preparing a place for you. It will greatly take away the fear of dying. It is an awful thing to die—even for a forgiven and sanctified soul—to enter on a world unknown, unseen, untried. One thing takes away fear; Christ is preparing a place suitable for my soul—he knows all the wants and weaknesses of my frame—I know he will make it a pleasant home for me.

Digitized by Google

III. All Christ's people are servants, and have their work assigned them. (Verse 34.)

(1.) Ministers are servants, and have their work assigned them. Two kinds are here mentioned. (1.) Stewards. These seem to be the servants to whom he gave authority. All ministers should be stewards, rightly dividing the word of life, giving to every one of his family his portion of meat in due season. Oh! it is a blessed work to feed the Church of God, which he has purchased with his own blood—to give milk to babes, and strong meat to grown men, to give convenient food to every one. Pray for your ministers, that they may be made stewards. There are few such. (2) Porters. He commanded the porter to watch. It is the office of some ministers to stand at the door and invite every sinner, saying, "Enter ye in at the strait gate;" some ministers have not the gift of feeding the Church of God and watering it. Paul planted; Apollos watered. Some are only doorkeepers in the house of my God. Learn not to despise any of the true servants of God. Are all apostles? Are all prophets? He has appointed some to stand at the door, and some to break the children's bread; despise neither.

(2.) All Christians are servants and have their work assigned them. Some people think that ministers only have to work for Christ; but see here: "He gave to every man his work." In a great house the steward and the porter are not the only servants; there are many more, and all have their work to do. Just so among the people of Christ. Ministers are not the only servants of Christ; all that believe on him are his servants.

(1.) Learn to be working Christians. "Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves." It is very striking to see the uselessness of many Christians. Are there none of you who know what it is to be selfish in your Christianity? You have seen a selfish child go into a secret place to enjoy some delicious morsel undisturbed by his companions. So it is with some Christians; they feed upon Christ and forgiveness, but it is alone and all for themselves. Are there not some of you who can enjoy being a Christian, while your dearest friend is not, and yet you will not speak to him? See, here, you have got your work to do. When Christ found you, he said, "Go, work in my vineyard." What were you hired for, if it was not to work? What were you saved for, if it was not to spread salvation? What blessed for? O my Christian friends, how little you live as if you were the servants of Christ! How much idle time and idle talk you have; this is not like a good servant. How many things you have to do for yourself; how few for Christ and his people! This is not like a servant.

(2.) Learn to keep to your own work. In a great house every servant has his own peculiar work. One man is the porter to open the door, another is the steward to provide food for the family, a third has to clean the rooms, a fourth has to dress the food, a fifth has to wait upon the guests. Every one has his proper place, and no servant interferes with another. If all were to become porters and open the door, what would become of the stewardship? or if all were to be stewards, who would clean the house? Just so it is with Christians. Every one has his peculiar work assigned him and should not leave it: "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called." Obadiah had his work appointed him in the court of the wicked Ahab. God placed him, his servant, there,

Digitized by Google

saying, "Work here for me." Does any one of you belong to a wicked family? Seek not to be removed; Christ has placed you there to be his servant, work for him. The Shunamite had her work; when the prophet asked, "Wilt thou be spoken for to the king?" she said, "I dwell among mine own people." Once a poor demonaic, whom Jesus healed, besought Jesus that he might follow after him. Howbeit Jesus suffered him not, but saith unto him, "Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee." Learn, my dear friend, to keep to your own work. When the Lord has hung up a lamp in one corner, is there no presumption in removing it to another? Is not the Lord wiser than man? Every one of you has your work to do for Christ *where you are.* Are you on a sick bed?—still you have your work to do for Christ there as much as the highest servant of Christ in the world. The smallest twinkling star is as much a servant of God as the midday-sun—only live for Christ where you are.

IV. Christ is coming back again, and we know not when: "Watch ye, therefore; for ye know not when the Master cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning: lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping." (Verse 35, 36.) Two things are here declared.

(1.) That Christ is coming back again. The whole Bible bears witness to this. The master of the house has been a long time away on his journey, but he will come back again. When Christ ascended from his disciples, and a cloud received him out of their sight, and they were looking steadfastly into heaven, the angels said: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him to go into heaven." He went up in a cloud; he shall come in the clouds.

(2.) That Christ will come back suddenly. The whole Bible bears witness to this. (1.) In one place it is compared to a snare which suddenly entraps the unwary wild beast: "As a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth." (2.) Again, to a thief: "The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." (3.) Again, to a bridegroom coming suddenly: "At midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh." (4.) Again, to the waters of the flood; (5.) again, to the fiery rain that fell on Sodom and Gomorrah; (6.) and here to the sudden coming home of the master of the house: "Ye know not when the master of the house cometh." Now, my dear friends, I am far from discouraging those who, with humble prayerfulness, search into the records of prophecy to find out what God has said as to the Second Coming of the Son of Man. We are not like the first disciples of Jesus if we do not often put the question, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" But the truth which I wish to be written on your hearts is this: that the coming shall be sudden—sudden to the world, sudden to the children of God. "In such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh:" "Ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at cockcrowing, or in the morning." O my friends, your faith is incomplete if you do not live in the daily faith of a coming Saviour.

V. Watch: "And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch." (Verse 37.)

(1.) Ministers should watch. This word is especially addressed to the

Digitized by Google

porter: "Watch ye therefore." Ah! how watchful we should be; many things make us sleep. (1.) Want of faith. When a minister loses sight of Christ crucified, risen, coming again, then he cannot watch for souls. Pray that your ministers may have a watching eye always on Christ. (2.) Seeing so many careless souls: ah; you little know how it staggers the ministers of Christ. A young believer comes with a glowing heart to tell of Christ, and pardon, and the new heart. He knows it is the truth of God, he states it simply, freely with all his heart, he presses it on men, he hopes to see them melt like icicles before the sun—alas! they are as cold and dead as ever. They live on in their sins; they die in their sins. Ah! you little know how this makes him dull, and heavy, and heart-broken. My friends, pray that we may not sleep. Pray that your carelessness may only make us watch the more.

(2.) All Christians should watch. Ah, if Christ *is* at hand! (1.) Take heed that ye be found forgiven. Many Christians seem to live without a realising view of Christ. The eye should be fixed on Christ. Your eye is shut. Oh! if you would abide in Christ, then let him come to-night, "at even, or at midnight, or at cockcrow, or in the morning." He is welcome, thrice welcome; even so, come, Lord Jesus. (2.) Take heed lest ye be found in any course of sin. Many Christians seem to walk, if I mistake not, in courses of sin. It is hard to account for it, but so it seems to be; some Christians seem to be sleeping, in luxury, in covetousness, in evil company. Ah! how would you like to be overtaken thus by the coming Saviour? Try your daily occupation, your daily state of feeling, your daily enjoyments—try them by this test: am I doing as I would wish to do on the day of his coming?

(3.) Christless souls, how dreadful is your case. Death may be sudden, ah, how sudden it sometimes is; you may have no time for repentance, no breath to pray! The coming of the Saviour will be more sudden still. Ye know neither the day nor the hour. You know not God—you have not obeyed the gospel. Oh! how will you do in the day of the Lord's anger?

The late ROBERT M. M'CHEYNE.

DESTRUCTION OR EXTENDED RESTORATION.

To the Rev. HENRY CONSTABLE, A.M., *Prebendary of Cork.*

DEAR SIR,

As you have thought it worth while to review at some length, in the pages of the *Rainbow*, "the view of man's destiny in the future world *as it is represented in the publications of Mr. Henry Dunn*," I may, perhaps, be permitted through the same medium to offer a few remarks on some very grave, although doubtless, unintentional *misrepresentations* which are to be found in the article referred to.

Not once or twice only, but *thirty-one* times, and in every variety of form, is the statement reiterated that "according to Mr. Dunn," there is to be a "restoration in hell of vast numbers to the image of God;" that

Digitized by Google

"hell will be, in his view, the great field on which the harvest of the human race will be reaped;" that the soul in Hades "is being prepared to benefit by the more efficacious process to be undergone in hell;" that "hell is the true theatre of hope;" that "hell is clothed in bright colours for its inhabitants;" that "*there* men will not be put to any trial that will distress them;" that "the way from hell will be a broad and an easy way;" and such like.

Yet, strange to say, this language is *never* used by me, nor can a single line from anything that I have written, be produced in its support. Listen to my own words, "Hell is the *final lot* of the irreclaimably wicked—a judgment directly inflicted by the hand of God. It has no gradations, for how can anything like *degree* be associated with an *everlasting* punishment, first represented as being cast into a "lake of fire," and then explained to be "the second death."*

A further injustice is committed in the following paragraph—"He" (Mr. Dunn), "relies upon the Jewish popular notion, taught and cherished by the Talmud, that a Jew could not be lost." Allow me to say that Mr. Dunn does nothing of the kind. His words are, "It is clear enough that the Jews, whether right or wrong in so doing, *regarded themselves* as a saved people, and as such heirs to all the promises embodied in the discourses of the prophets. The *popular notion* was that a Jew could not be lost, and recent investigations into the Talmud have shown that the modern doctrine of eternal punishment was unknown to them." You admit this yourself, saying, "Mr. Dunn has most faithfully represented the popular view."

Under what an extraordinary misapprehension then must the following paragraphs have been written:—

"We see that there were two different interpretations given to the promises made to Israel. One of these interpretations was that they were made to every natural descendant of Abraham; the other that they were made only to such as inherited Abraham's faith and obedience. The Jews in general, the Talmud, and Mr. Dunn, have adopted the first of these; the old prophets, Christ, and his apostles took the second. . . . . The proud boast that they were as mere natural born Jews, 'the temple of the Lord,' that unpopular prophet Jeremiah pronounced to be 'lying words,' and for his unpopular kind of language he got himself thrust into a dungeon. When the Pharisee and the Sadducee came to John for baptism, probably expecting some compliment for their condescension, the rough preacher struck a rough blow at their favourite idea—'Think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father,' and for those and the like rough words he lost his head. . . . . Called upon to choose between these opposing authorities, we have no hesitation in following the latter, and we would, in all earnestness, recommend Mr. Dunn to do the same."

Singular counsel this to give to a man whose own words are, "The apprehension that 'the kingdom' was *not* to be theirs *simply as Israelites* broke upon the Jewish people slowly—John had indicated what was coming when he received the Scribes and Pharisees with the unwelcome

* "Destiny of the Human Race" (p. 307). See the whole of chapter ix., entitled "Hell" (pp. 276—316).

Digitized by Google

command, 'Bring forth fruits meet for repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham."* And again, "*Nationally*, the rejection of Christ was a deliberate refusal to accept Messiah whom God had sent to reign over them; and it involved national ruin, utter and irremediable. *Individually*—that is to those who had heard the words, and witnessed the miracles of Jesus, who had 'seen and hated' the Son of God—it was equivalent to hating goodness. *By* such it was a 'counting of themselves unworthy of eternal life.' *Of* such the Lord himself says, 'He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.'"†

What then becomes of the assertion, "He (Mr. Dunn) says in effect, to all who will listen to his words: 'You may be as wicked as the men of Sodom; as stiff-necked as the Israelite of Jeremiah's day; as iniquitous as the generation which filled up the measure of their fathers by crucifying Christ; as ungodly as the men of the last day on whom the Son of Man shall come as a thief in the night. If you are, you shall certainly suffer retribution, your iniquities shall be visited on your head, yet only *in the very same way* that believers shall suffer retribution after they too have appeared at the judgment seat. (p. 65.) But you are not to suppose that you have lost the opportunity of repentance. Far from it. This future time of pain shall be to you the blessed period during which you shall, with scarce the possibility of failure, and *with little or no effort on your part*, make sure of *that kingdom of glory and joy* which is yours by the oath of the covenant of God.' Is this, or is it not, an encouragement to sin?"

I reply, it *is* without doubt, and much more. *The statement is itself a sin.* It is the sin of attributing to a man sentiments which he utterly abominates—statements which are the very reverse of what he has made. It is the sin of substituting for an author's own words the wayward inferences of an opponent. It is *the sin* which is committed by the many who insist that since the Prebendary of Cork denies the immortality of the soul, and holds that it will be destroyed, he is no better than a French materialist; for they too believe that men die like the beasts and are annihilated.

A still greater wrong, however, if it be possible, is inflicted a little further on. The following are your exact words:—

"From this future of hell, as regards a very considerable number of mankind, we gather Mr. Dunn's exact views *of the effect of redemption.* We are at a loss, indeed, to know in what way redemption, according to him, was effected; for he is of opinion not only that the glorious prospects of the world could have been brought about *without the death of Christ*, but that *it ought* to have been effected without the Redeemer's humiliation, rejection, and crucifixion (p. 19): but he does believe in redemption through Christ; and as Christ was really put to death by the Jews, he thinks that his death *had something to say to it.*" (p.142—3.)

Let us then turn to these very pages, and see what is *actually* said. It is this:—

"In Scripture it is *the death* of Christ, not the manner of it, that is

* "Kingdom of God." (p. 21.) † "Kingdom of God." (p. 22.)

Digitized by Google

always associated with human salvation. It is the shed blood (for 'the blood is the life') that purifies; not, however, like the prophet's 'nitre and much soap' (Jer. ii. 22), but by making us one with Christ *in his death.* In this sense it is the blood that redeems (Eph. i. 7; 1 Peter i. 19; Rev. v. 9); that nourishes the soul (John vi. 54); that secures pardon (Heb. ix. 22); that gives access to God (Heb. x. 19; ix. 12); that cleanses (1 John i. 7; Rev. i. 5); that purges from sin (Heb ix. 14); and that fits for service. (1 Pet. i. 2). *In it* we have communion with the Lord. (1 Cor. x. 16.) *By it* we are brought nigh (Eph. ii. 13); and *through it* we are justified. (Rom v. 9; iii. 25.) And again, "Christ fulfils his work by dying that we might live; by *becoming in death a propitiation* for our sins; and by opening *through his blood* a way into the holiest for all who believe. Christ was emphatically a *sin-bearer;* he bare our sins in his own body on the tree."*

By what strange alchemy these words can be transformed into "As Christ was really put to death by the Jews," he (Mr. Dunn) thinks, "that his (the Lord's) death *had something to say to it,*" may well pass the comprehension of all but persons who are familiar with theological controversy.

On minor matters, it is undesirable to say anything beyond observing that the silence complained of regarding the fallen angels, in the statement "Of devils, he (Mr. Dunn) has not said a word," arises only from the absence of any reference in Scripture to their redemption. Nowhere are we taught that the future of impenitent men "is inextricably mixed up with that of the fallen angels." These apostate spirits are not, *to me,* what my brothers and sisters of mankind are. John *wept much* when no man was found worthy to open and to read the mystic book of the apocalyptic vision. This was *human.* The tenderness that thus expressed itself was neither weak nor blameworthy; it was the piety of the child of God. He could not be content till he knew more of the destinies of his race, because the Father of that race would not allow him to be content.

If the same interest in his fellow creatures has led Mr. Dunn for many years to search diligently and with microscopic eye the Scriptures of truth, in order to discover what is *there* written (however dimly), regarding the future of *humanity,* let him be forgiven for not having abandoned the sure word of God, in order to indulge in speculations about the fallen angels.

The following passage will, perhaps, best explain the principle on which he has proceeded:—

"In relation to the method of investigation pursued, let it be observed, we have strictly confined ourselves to Scripture testimony. We have not discussed the supposed *reasonableness* of any particular view. We have not attempted to weaken the force of the words 'eternal,' or 'everlasting.' We have not asked what is most in accordance with *our sense* of right. We have not imagined it possible for man to be more merciful than his Maker; for well do we know that, if we have either piety or benevolence, *he gave it us,* and the fountain is surely higher than the stream. We have simply enquired as to what is *scriptural.* We acknowledge no other authority. Only let us be satisfied that any given doctrine is revealed *there,* and we bow; for we *believe* in the Bible as a divine revelation, and have no sympathy whatever with those who would judge such

* Kingdom of God. (pp. 62, 63, 65, 142, 143, &c.)

Digitized by Google

a message from God by human consciousness, or measure it by any supposed spiritual intuitions of their own."*

In pursuing his enquiries as to what is *revealed* regarding the final lot of man, the author of the "Destiny of the Human Race" has never desired to be regarded in any other character than that of *a student of Scripture.* He shrinks from dogmatism on a subject which is obviously, and for wise ends, left in holy obscurity. Not therefore, to be neglected, but to be examined with peculiar reverence and tenderness; all conclusions relating thereto being *tested* by the general spirit of Scripture and by the instincts of the renewed heart—that "unction of the Holy One" which is at once light and love.

The *anger* that is excited in the minds of so many good people by the re-investigation of any doctrine that has been long and generally accepted, must be *borne with.* It is the inevitable consequence of *unaccustomed* light being presented to unprepared eyes. In this primary stage, if people perceive at all what is set before them, it is almost always in exaggerated and distorted forms. They behold 'men as trees walking.' Time alone will enable them to see *truly;* and not till they see truly will they feel charitably towards those who differ from them. Patience, meekness, quietness, and humility, are therefore essential to progress. The formation of *a party* in furtherance of a particular view may seem at first sight to be very desirable. But it is never so in what we term the long run. Party stereotypes thought, and hinders, instead of helping on any truth, that to be received aright, must be held in the spirit rather than in the letter.

For friendly words that forbid the supposition of intentional wrong, due acknowledgment is cheerfully rendered. You, Sir, express the kind wish that Mr. Dunn "may be led to re-consider his position;" that he "may one day see the *whole truth*" (the italics are not mine); that "the mists which now surround his mental vision may disperse." "Such a man," you say "we would gladly hail with us in our great controversy,"

Utinam noster esses!

The very book condemned is said to be "a remarkable volume" and its author is credited with "undoubted talent," and much "depth of thought."

Mr. Dunn sincerely regrets that he cannot hold out in return any prospect that the invitation given is likely to be accepted. Thirty years ago he held as tenaciously as yourself to what is now known as the doctrine of annihilation, the literal destruction, soul and body in hell, of all who are not here renewed in the spirit of their minds. Prolonged study of Scripture and frequent meditation led him to the conclusion that this dreary and desolate belief found only a partial support in the Bible; that the final ruin of *the race* was inconsistent with the language of the New Testament; that while Christ has always had in the world an elect church consisting of *few* rather than of many, the gospel is everywhere said to be not only a provision of mercy *intended* for "*the many*," but that it will actually be a great advantage to such; that one day Christ will "destroy the works of the devil," and God will be all in all.

You say, "Mr. Dunn has for us no distinct positive doctrine. He unsettles faith, but does not build where he throws down." This is a serious charge, but I venture to think it is altogether an unfounded one. It would

* "Destiny of the Human Race." (pp. 305—6.)

Digitized by Google

be easy to show that the hope of a large restoration is anything but a negative doctrine, did space permit. *That*, however, cannot be done here.

I beg to remain, dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
HENRY DUNN.

HEART LONGINGS.

JESUS, Shepherd, Lover, Lord;
Thou glorious ONE, thou LIVING WORD,
On whom alone our hopes rely,
For thee we look, to thee we cry.

Our eyes grow dim, our hearts are faint,
Our strength is weak, our courage spent;
Our hope our foes in mockery spurn,
And say, "He never will return."

O Lord, our Life, our glorious All,
For thee we look, on thee we call,
Our faith revive, our hope renew;
For thou wilt come, for thou art true.

Thy word is passed, thy promise given,
That thou wilt come again from heaven,
To take unto thyself thy bride,
To reign in glory by thy side.

Fulfil thy promise, gracious Lord;
We will not doubt thy sacred word;
We love thee much for all thy grace,
But oh! we long to see thy face!

Literature.

The Life of the Rev. Thomas Collins. By the Rev SAMUEL COLEY. With a Portrait. Second Edition. London: Elliot Stock.

THOMAS COLLINS deserved a biography, and Samuel Coley has proved himself just the man for the biographer. Kindred spirits, they understood each other. The book is rich and racy, but it is better than that; it is a beautiful picture of a hardworking and devoted servant of Jesus Christ.

Light at Eventide; Large Print Readings for the Sick and Aged. London: W. Macintosh.

THE sub-title describes the book. It consists of Prayers, Scriptures, and Hymns in large type; and will be welcomed by the sick and aged.

Mertonville Park; or Herbert Seymours' Choice. By the Author of "Ellen Clinton." London: James Clarke and Co., 13, Fleet Street.

WE have not for a long time read anything equal to this for pathos, feeling, and fascinating power. It is really an admirable story, both in the development of character and the exhibition of truth. Altogether it is a charming book, and the most inveterate enemy of religious tales would say so if he would but read it. We heartily thank the fair authoress for her labour of love.

The Confessions of a Clock. By W. J. B. London: William Macintosh.

A WELL told little story, with a valuable practical purpose.

Digitized by Google

The Second Coming of Christ; Two Sermons preached at Newport Pagnell. By J. A. Dean, of Cranfield. Newport Pagnell: Simpson & Son.

We are glad to read such clear, earnest words on this great subject. These are faithful sermons, and contain much condensed truth; whilst the fervour of utterance shows that the speaker felt the inspiration of his theme.

Pre-Millenarianism; Things that are not true. By Thomas Nicholson. Gloucester: F. C. Workman.

Had Mr. Nicholson really understood the faith of those who expect the coming of Christ before the establishment of the Kingdom, he would not have written this tract. It is the easiest thing in the world to deny a proposition. To say a thing "is not true" does not prove it false. Of course, a man of Mr. Nicholson's intelligence does not require such elementary information as this, but there are many persons who readily accept bold denial as the best of arguments. So far as he has caught the doctrine actually held by enlightened Chiliasts, his denial amounts to nothing; and where he denies the truth of propositions which we do *not* hold, we have to thank him for his unintentional support of our cause. We would courteously recommend him to re-examine the entire subject, for we would like to see such a man altogether right.

Poor George; or, the World of Love. By Miss Sargant. London: W. Macintosh.

An interesting picture of what has, substantially, occurred in many a village family. Miss Sargant writes gracefully In a Sunday-school library her book would be in place.

REST WHEN THE LORD COMES.

And is there none before? No perfect peace,
Unbroken by the storms and cares of life,
Until the time of waiting for Him cease
By His appearing to destroy the strife?
No, none before.

Are we not told that through the flag of grace
By faithful messengers of God unfurled,
All men will be converted, and the place
Of man's rebellion be a holy world?
So we are told.

Is it not true that to the Church is given
The holy honour of dispelling night,
And bringing back the human race to heaven,
By kindling everywhere the gospel light?
It is *not* true!

Is this the hope—that Christ the Lord will come,
In all the glory of his royal right,
Redeemer and Avenger, taking home
His saints, and crushing the Usurper's might?
This is the hope.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

JULY 1, 1869.

CHRIST AND CHRISTENDOM.

THOUGHTFUL men are convinced that great changes are at hand throughout the world. Nor is this conviction felt by religious thinkers only, but by intelligent men of every civilised nation. Philosophers of every school, politicians of every party, Christians of every Church, *feel* that, ere long, some altogether extraordinary event will arrest and absorb the attention of mankind. The old landmarks, secular and sacred, are passing away with ominous rapidity, as if swept before an irresistible flood. No conservatism, either in Church or state, is strong enough to check the impetuous rush. No appeal to ancestral wisdom has power to stop the speed with which the world is hasting to some marvellous crisis. And no earnest warnings of the possibility of some irremediable disaster have the effect desired by those who utter them.

I. All this is simply matter of fact, irrespective of doctrinal peculiarity. You may mourn over it, you may rejoice in it, or you may accept it, without either grief or gladness—if that be possible—as one of the inevitable things in the future of humanity, which God *may* either incorporate with his purposes, or bend to his will in the development of his infinite wisdom, but you cannot deny the fact itself. *That* is beyond controversy. Everywhere men are asking, substantially, if not in so many words—"Whither are we drifting? what is coming on the earth? what is to be the end of these things?" Ecclesiastical council, political manifesto, philosophical essay, religious book—it is all the same; for whether joyous anticipation or gloomy foreboding be the outline, unprecedented change, inevitable transition, is unquestionably the text. On that all men are agreed, with a unanimity of sentiment as remarkable as it is new.

But here the unanimity ends, and a perfect babel of propositions regarding the future stuns the ear. "Lo! here," or, "Lo! there," is the

Digitized by Google

panacea. Let the Church of Rome have her own way; cast aside your unreasoning Protestant prejudices, and fall quietly into her loving motherly arms; do the best you can to facilitate her cherished hope of universality; and she will still the commotions of the times, and bring in the millennial age of peace, and faith, and love. Or, if you demur to this invitation, lend your energies to unfettered Protestantism; help to consolidate its divided forces, and to give it unity of thought and action; let its appeals to the "instinct of liberty," and its denunciations of priestcraft be heard through the nations; and no doubt the day will come, when, through its agency, "the wilderness and solitary place shall be glad, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose." Or, if you think intelligence from the dead more reliable than the voices of prophets and apostles in the Christian's Book, unite yourself with the rapidly swelling ranks of "Spiritualism," and hasten its happy age of abolished creeds, annihilated churches, and universal "free love." Or, if prejudiced against this way of hushing the groans of creation, in consequence of the reports of its doings in the Western world, there are still other candidates for your suffrage, and other prescriptions for the restoration of the patient. To mention but one—which has acceptance in many parts of Europe to an extent that is absolutely incredible to those who are unacquainted with the facts—universal democracy, on the principle of no Church, no Bible, no God. To bring about the promised time of peace, prosperity, and joy to mankind, the golden age of poets and seers, this proposition offers us *naked* ATHEISM!

Let not the reader imagine that we have our eye only on the Red Republicans of France, or the Social Democrats of Germany, and their Italian and English sympathisers, the roughest of the European peoples, who cannot brook the restraints of law, and who have nothing to lose amidst the fury and havoc of revolution. The atheism of such men carries its antidote with it in the immorality, vulgarity, and lawlessness of its advocates. It is from their leaders in the high places of "philosophy" that the danger comes. Men of scientific attainment, more or less profound, are the actual apostles of this Godless gospel. It is no longer the doctrine of inspiration, or the genuineness of this or that Biblical document, which is called in question, but the entire book is pronounced a collection of fables; and that there ever was, or is, such a person as the Christ of God, is openly denied.

"A keen, learned and relentless criticism," says Mr. Dale,* "is sweeping like a destructive tempest over the whole of our sacred books. That 'higher criticism,' the ultimate aim of which is, we are told, to 'discover

* Christ and the Controversies of Christendom. By R. W. Dale, M.A. The Address delivered from the chair of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, in May last. London: HODDER & STOUGHTON.

Digitized by Google

what actually happened,' and which refuses to be satisfied with what is 'only related to have happened,' is attempting in these last days to reconstruct out of what it regards as the confused, unsifted, and untrustworthy literature of ages of credulity, passion, and fanaticism, the whole of that wonderful story which has solaced the sufferings, sustained the strength, and inspired the sanctity of so many generations of saints. The Pentateuch and the Acts of the Apostles are alike impeached. The history of the foundation of the Jewish state, and the history of the origin of the Christian Church, are both to be re-written; but the tragic miracles of the Exodus, and the awful mysteries of Sinai are to be excluded from the first; and, from the second, the diviner glories which bore witness to the supernatural commission of the Lord Jesus Christ, while he was on earth, and which signalised his return to the throne of the Father.

"To this attempt the 'higher criticism,' is impelled, not by its native instincts alone, but by the whole temper and spirit of our times. The supernatural is to be expelled from every province in which its presence has hitherto been recognised. Human thought and volition are but functions of man's organisation. The history of nations is the necessary development of laws which may be discovered by human science, and over the action and results of which no will, human or divine, has any controul. The material universe, with all its majesty and beauty, bears no witness to the power, and wisdom, and beneficence of the eternal God—'The heavens no longer declare any other glory than that of Hipparchus, of Kepler, and of Newton, and of all those who have contributed to establish their laws.'

"For centuries there has been no such crisis in the religious thought and life of mankind, as that which is now impending. Hostility to the Christian faith, deeper, sterner, and more systematic than that which terrified our fathers in the most volcanic and tempestuous hours of the French Revolution; theological confusion and uncertainty, far more chaotic than that which followed the revolt of Northern Europe against the infallible Roman Church;—these are the perils which we have to encounter. The time for speaking lightly of these tremendous controversies has long gone by. If only a theory of inspiration were breaking down, if men were discussing nothing more serious than the precise and minute accuracy of the four Gospels, if we were threatened with nothing more formidable than the demonstration of the historical untrustworthiness of a few chapters here and there in the Old Testament, we might look on calmly, and wait the issue of the conflict with indifference.

"But it becomes plainer every year that the real questions in debate are far different from these. The storm has moved round the whole horizon; but it is rapidly concentrating its strength and fury above one sacred Head. This, this is the real issue of the fight. Is Christendom to believe in

Digitized by Google

Christ any longer, or no? It is a battle in which everything is to be lost or won. It is not a theory of ecclesiastical polity which is in danger, it is not a creed, it is not the Old Testament or the New, but the claim of Christ himself to be the Son of God and the Saviour of mankind. This is surely enough to stir the Church to vehement enthusiasm, and to inspire it with its old heroic energy. It is a controversy, not for theologians merely, but for every man who has seen the face of Christ, and can bear personal testimony to his power and glory."

II. Existing religious agencies have failed to realize the expectations of the Church.

Whether those expectations are justified by Scripture, or whether the arguments used to create them were sound is not here in question. As before, we state a broad fact about which there cannot possibly be two opinions, as every one who understands the matter must at once admit. The result of the manifold efforts to evangelise the heathen at home and abroad falls immeasurably below anticipation. At home, with several large ecclesiastical bodies having wealth, influence, learning and eloquence at command, we cannot overtake the dark masses of ignorance, crime, and misery that crowd and poison our great cities, Scripture Readers, Town Missionaries, Bible Women, Home Missions, Evangelists, and a whole array of voluntary labourers, such as Sunday School teachers, Christian Instruction Visitors, and Tract Distributors, supplement the labours of the clergy and pastors of these large churches; and yet hamlet, village, town, city, have to this day dark souls on which the life-giving light of salvation never dawned with transforming power. Abroad, the aggregate result of the labours of all our large missionary societies is, by universal admission, far below what the predictions of platform, pulpit, and press led many to expect. Christian labour, that is to say, labour for Christ's sake, with the view of promoting his truth, and with the love of souls in the heart of the labourer, is a sublimely beautiful thing. *Such* labour undertaken at his bidding, and with an intelligent perception of what the Church is to do and to be during the absence of her Head at the Father's right hand, cannot be in vain; but if the Church forgets her witness-bearing mission, and puffs herself up with the idea that *she* is to be a victorious conqueror in the world that rejected and crucified her Lord, the exaggerated self-importance will be rebuked by hosts of enemies springing up to challenge her claims and her Master's too; and the terrible disproportion between her pretensions and her achievements will be followed by a reaction at once humiliating and distressing. Mistaken views of her own position in the divinely arranged system of things are sure to be accompanied or followed by mistaken views, more or less serious, of the revealed character and will of God. If she says, "*I have to bring the world to* CHRIST," she says what neither

Digitized by Google

prophet nor apostle sanctions. If the mistake stopped with herself, the matter would not be so serious; but in the nature of things that could not be; and consequently it has brought serious discredit upon the entire Christian revelation, and upon the claims of our blessed Saviour himself. Men who knew not the Lord for themselves, naturally accepted this declaration of the Church as one of the testing claims of Christianity; but seeing that fact has failed to justify it, they *now* say, "How can we either believe these men or the book whose precepts they profess to obey? If God has commissioned them to convert the world, as they say he has, how is it that the end seems farther off than ever? Surely, if they had divine authority they would have divine help; but the results, according to all accounts, are not very brilliant."

Now it is very easy to call these men "scoffers" and "worldlings"; very likely many of them have an undoubted right to these titles; but *what right have Christians* to bring discredit upon divine truth by making it responsible for doctrines which it disowns? We *press this question* as it contains the point at issue. What authority have we—for it really comes to this—to say that the Son of God has transferred his royal rights to our weak hands, to subdue all nations to his will? We first misread the document by which our conduct should be regulated during the Master's absence, and then, seeing that we necessarily fail to do the thing which is *not* expected of us, the world, believing our assurance that it *is* expected, casts discredit upon the entire Word of God. Need we wonder? No, but we *should* mourn!

III. The present state of Christendom is precisely such as might be expected if it were certain that the Christian dispensation would end in an atheistic apostacy.

But that it will so end is certain. There can be no more doubt about it than about the gift of eternal life to him that believes in Jesus. There is no *greater* authority for a sinner's salvation through faith in Christ, or for any other fundamental doctrine of revelation, than there is for the statement that this age will close amidst absolute devil worship and more terrific judgments than have ever hitherto fallen upon our guilty world. The warnings of the prophets of both Testaments, and of the Lord himself, are so numerous and clear that every reader of the Bible should be intimately acquainted with them. The representations given of the close of this dispensation are so minute, startling, and awful, that it is amazing how any Christian *can* seriously believe in the conversion of the world by the agency of the Church, before the return of the Lord Jesus. Deeply stamped upon the book are the appalling features of the coming evil time; and the chief actors in the closing tragedy reach a height of such unprecedented wickedness and blasphemy that, but for the sudden manifestation

Digitized by Google

of the King of kings and Lord of lords, in the great day of his wrath, the triumph of the devil and his agents over this part of creation would be complete. Why, the very language of the panic-stricken foe, when the Lord comes to judgment, *proves*, if we had no other testimony to adduce, that instead of a converted and loyal world, he will find a world of daring rebels. Here it is: "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"

IV. Yet the reluctance of Christians generally to embrace the hope which God has provided against the day of storm and tempest is strangely unyielding.

That hope is the return of the Lord Jesus. There is no other. It is God's arrangement, and we would not have it otherwise. It gloriously meets the entire case, solves all difficulties, whether of human or Satanic origin, more than realises the most ardent hopes of the believer, baffles the schemes of the impious Usurper and his armies, and overwhelmes them in the fiery flood of vengeance which will utterly destroy them. But the majority of Christians cling to the traditions of a corrupt theology, and look upon those who would bring them back to the pure apostolic fountain as innovators and teachers of novel doctrines. It so happens, however, that the "novelty" rests with them, not with us; and we tell them in all Christian sincerity and affection, that *no* preaching, however fervent, forcible, and clear, that ignores the near approach of the Great Judge, will either arouse the Church to a recognition of her true place, or stem the torrent of evil which is to bear upon its dark bosom the personal Antichrist at whose feet apostate Christendom will fall down and worship. We heard Mr. Dale's discourse, from which an extract has been made, and we felt that it just wanted *one* thing to make it perfect—the doctrine of the second advent of the Lord, to meet the world-storm that is about to burst, and to complete the grand scheme of grace and glory in which the love and wisdom of God are so marvellously unfolded. The assembled representatives of Congregationalism never listened to a discourse more worthy of profound attention, and that is saying *much;* but our gifted, learned, and eloquent brother, will pardon us for imploring his attention to the *fact*, that the solution of the controversies of Christendom can be found only in the personal coming of CHRIST.

Digitized by Google

MISSIONARY THEOLOGY:

CONSIDERED IN ITS TWO DOCTRINES OF ENDLESS MISERY; AND A POST-MILLENNIAL ADVENT OF CHRIST.*

BY EDWARD WHITE,

MINISTER OF ST. PAUL'S CHAPEL, HAWLEY ROAD, KENTISH TOWN.

THE Rev. Dr. Mullens, Secretary to the London Missionary Society, in a recent work entitled *London and Calcutta* designed to trace the outlines of Protestant Missions in India and to stimulate the flagging zeal of their supporters, asks—"Why have Missionary Meetings failed so greatly to attract young men?" "Why are the very churches which once supported them best now giving to them only half of what they gave thirty years ago?" "Where are the crowded meetings which welcomed Williams, and Moffat, and Knibb, and listened to their stories?" "Were a DEEP, SETTLED INTEREST, felt by Christian men at large in mission work abroad, these things could not be."—Dr. Mullens answers these searching questions by an argument designed to prove that the causes of the comparative apathy are ignorance of the encouraging results already attained, and, above all, too exclusive devotion to the prosecution of the Home Missions of Christianity—an exclusiveness which robs foreign missions of their due share of attention and support. The larger part of Dr. Mullens' work is expended in setting forth the general social effects of Christianity in the East, and in presenting a brilliant picture of the results to be expected in the future from the gradual undermining of heathenism. The chief practical object of his book is, apparently, to persuade the churches to make larger pecuniary contributions to the funds of the missionary societies, under the idea that a few hundreds of additional missionaries will hasten the conversion of Asia to the belief of the gospel.

For Dr. Mullens, as a laborious missionary and able director of mission work, it is impossible not to entertain warm regard and very sincere reverence. It is not, however, inconsistent with that regard to offer a few suggestions in the way of further answer to the questions proposed by him, as to the causes of that decline of interest in missions which he confesses and laments.

It is not necessary to deny the force of the allegation that the churches at home devote a disproportionate measure of attention to English objects. Men are naturally interested in the visible more than in the invisible, in

* This paper may be had separately, reprinted from the *Rainbow*, of Mr. ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row. Price Twopence.

Digitized by Google

England, which is seen, more than in India, which is unseen. The spiritual force which is required to sustain a deep and settled interest in the missions of the gospel is far greater than is usually supposed. They make a larger demand upon the spiritual nature of man than any other form of human endeavour. To feel compassion for the souls of nations whom we have never beheld, from whom we are divided by the diameter of the globe, who are physically and morally our antipodes, with whose natural character we have the faintest sympathy—to expend thought, effort, and considerable property in furthering the interest of those unknown nations in a world which is still more completely invisible and unknown, requires a depth of conviction, a strength of principle, an elevation of spirit, wholly foreign to ordinary human nature, and neither to be produced nor sustained except by the direct action of the Spirit of God.

The same Power which alone can "thrust forth" a true labourer into the harvest, can alone create or uphold a corresponding spirit of zeal, faith, and self-sacrifice in the churches which send him forth. The missionary agency abroad is the hand at the end of a long arm, extended by the Church at home. If that arm is paralysed at the shoulder, whence shall come the force by which blows shall be struck at the ends of the earth? A decline of the spiritual life, therefore, in England, a decay of faith in things unseen, a loss of spiritual power through the advance of habits of luxurious living, would necessarily take the form first of a loss of interest in the unseen field of foreign missions—a decline of interest soon to be followed by a similar decay in the work of God at home.

It is not my intention, however, to prosecute this line of enquiry. We shall proceed on the more agreeable hypothesis that the concern for the salvation of the heathen nations is just as earnest and real as ever it was; and suggest a few considerations tending to explain the nature of those influences which have so greatly repressed of late years the exhibitions of interest in missionary societies in nearly all Christian communities.

I. And in the first place, I venture to assign as one cause of the indisputable decline of interest in the existing foreign missions of the gospel, *a growing scepticism as to the theory on which they are established.*

In the apostolic age the doctrinal spirit and the missionary spirit were evolved by the Spirit of God in the church with equal power, and they ought never to be separated. Each requires combination with the other.

It has unhappily happened several times since that each has been developed alone. In some ages a spirit of missions has been developed apart from the spirit of doctrinal study, as in the second and third, the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In other cases, the doctrinal spirit has been evolved without a corresponding activity of the spirit which leads to the diffusion of the gospel. At the close of the last century, when the existing

Digitized by Google

Protestant missionary societies arose amidst the hurricanes of the French Revolution, the spirit of theological study, of careful, bold, devout, biblical criticism, on which the faith ought to be founded, was as nearly as possible defunct in England. Perhaps we may say that just at the very time when it became of more importance than ever that the church should take care what was to be taught as Christianity among the nations of the world, the work of evangelising was commenced, as it had been in several similar preceding ages of activity in Christendom, in a spirit of unquestioning submission to the forms of thought and expression stereotyped by previous generations. Never was any great enterprise begun with more simplicity of purpose, with more heroic faith, with more devoted piety, than the enterprise of the founders of the Baptist and Independent, and Episcopal Missions, at the close of the last century; and also, it must be added, never was any great enterprise begun with more unquestioning adhesion to the traditions of the fathers. There was scarcely a man among the whole company of persons engaged in that glorious undertaking who ever dreamed of doubting any of the doctrines stamped with the imprimatur of the sixteenth century Reformation. The powers of action awoke, as often before, in isolation, and the power of thought and truth-seeking still for the most part slumbered.

What has been the result of this phenomenon? Is it not this, that inasmuch as the theological spirit has since recovered its energy in the churches, and attention has been devoted once more to biblical criticism and doctrine, there is now a certain separation between the missions of Protestantism and the deeper home convictions of religious Englishmen. The Missionary Societies represent the thinking of seventy years ago, when the church accepted without question the traditions of Protestant theology handed down by the Reformers. But they are surrounded by a generation which has lifted the anchors of its theology, and which has drifted or sailed into other waters. In some of the most important particulars of Christian faith, indeed, there is no change. The faith in a divine Christ, in an atonement for sin, in the person and work of the Holy Spirit, in a gratuitous justification, is the same now as it was of old. But these doctrines were considered by the founders of missions as but a superstructure built on a deeper foundation. That foundation was an antecedent belief in the natural immortality of mankind, and their consequent destiny either to endless misery or endless joy. In the opinion of Dr. Carey, and those who first went with him to India, as well as of the churches in Britain, every human being was an immortal, was possessed of a soul as eternal in the future as the nature of God. Every inhabitant of India was thus regarded as an immortal. Every unregenerate soul, descended from Adam, was born under the curse of endless woe, and was, by its own sins,

Digitized by Google

confirmed in that direful destiny. Salvation could be effected only by the distinguishing grace of God in regeneration. All the unregenerate of all ages were unsaved, and the unsaved of India, as of all lands, were destined to be delivered over, as Dr. Carey says in one of his letters, to "endless misery." To endless misery had gone all the numberless unregenerate inhabitants of Asia during the ages of darkness preceding the advent of Dr. Carey to India. To "endless misery" were going all the millions who rejected his message, or refused to abandon their ancestral creeds. This is still the foundation of missionary theology. This is still what may be called the state creed of all the missionary societies. No one is considered at liberty to deny it in a missionary speech or sermon. It is the platform creed of Exeter-hall. The missionary students at the colleges are supposed to believe it. The directors are supposed to believe it. The missionaries abroad are supposed to believe it. No one who openly assailed it would be asked to assist at a missionary assembly, or to plead the cause of missions before the people.

And yet—it is disbelieved in the churches throughout the length and breadth of the country. It is doubted and denied with varying degrees of confidence. But it *is* doubted and denied almost universally, and most of all by persons of accurate knowledge and spiritual intelligence. The doubt and denial is not confined to sceptics, to mockers, to adversaries; but it is professed with more or less of openness by men whose knowledge gives the utmost weight to their judgment, and whose hardworking piety challenges comparison with that of any of the advocates of the older creed. One meets with a few earnest, and able, and unquestionably sincere, controversial supporters of that elder belief. The names of Dr. Pusey, of Dr. Salmon, of Dublin, and of the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, will occur to all readers. But no one who intimately knows English religious society will venture to deny that there has been an immense revolution in opinion as to the probable destiny of the ignorant idolatrous nations of the earth, and that it is the rarest thing to find even a secretary of a missionary society, or the tutor of a missionary college, who will, *when firmly pressed*, declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the opinions on this question of the founders of our missionary societies. Men, nowadays, have their doubts, their special theories of relief, their hopes, or their positive doctrines. Either they hold, as I am informed that some heads of colleges hold, that Scripture gives room for several opposite theories; or they lean to Universalism, with Mr. Jukes, and teach men to trust in future purgatories; or they wholly repudiate and openly denounce and assail the old missionary doctrine, and believe with us that they who have "sinned without law," and led impenitent lives under heathen darkness, shall "perish without law" and "die" with "few stripes;" but it is simply a

Digitized by Google

fact that opinion has changed and is changing here, and that the churches at home, acted upon by the revived spirit of doctrinal study, are silent where our fathers would have spoken, or doubt where they would have unhesitatingly followed the doctrine of the dark ages, or boldly deny where they would have awfully anathematised opposition. No one seems moved by the argument that such good men as our fathers were must have been right in all their doctrines. We know, as a matter of fact, that they were wholly mistaken in many things which they firmly believed. The truth is that Nature, and Scripture, and human life, are better understood than they were seventy years ago, and the conviction is widely spread that the ancient notion of the consignment to everlasting torment of the countless multitudes of the heathen who have been born in error, bred up in superstition, and who were abandoned to die either in total ignorance of the true gospel, or in rejection of a gospel message only partly revealed to them, *cannot possibly be true* under the government of Infinite Justice, Boundless Wisdom, and Eternal Love.

The general result is, that the religious public feel that the unchanged missionary theology does not, in some important respects, represent their present thoughts, and thence follows a decline of interest in the propagation of ideas no longer believed. Few men of the first class in either honesty or ability, offer themselves for missionary work. It is understood that the studies of college life are not likely to lead always to the faith of our forefathers: hence, since open denial, or opposition, or avowed scepticism is forbidden, strong men shrink from a vocation in which integrity of thought and speech will become penal; and the missionary work is delivered over to persons of a more compliant and docile constitution—men also will continue to utter in the ears of the heathen the monstrous unrealised propositions of a former day, or worse, who will keep silence about Hell altogether.

I attribute, therefore, the decline of interest in missionary societies to an unconfessed partial destruction of the faith on which they were founded, and for the propagation of which they are maintained. Men feel coldly towards a system which sends out missionaries, whose training at home consists very much in persuading them *not to think* conclusively of the questions of human retribution and destiny; and which discourages the expression of belief, whether at home or abroad, in a sense accordant with the maturest thought of the English churches. The persuasion is universal that the missions of the gospel ought to represent the results of England's most earnest studies. It is felt that they do not represent them. It is felt that this state of things ought to be altered—that there ought to be more space allowed both at college, and in the mission field, certainly for doubt, for undecided opinion, and even for open variation from the ancient

Digitized by Google

creed—that there ought to be liberty for missionaries to express abroad, especially in their dealings with the educated men of India and China, ideas which are gaining ascendancy over the best minds at home. It is felt that the governing power of missions ought not to be exclusively in the hands of men who think on all subjects as our fathers did seventy years ago—or worse still, in the hands of men who only *pretend* to think as they did. It is felt that Jesuitism among Protestants is just as demoralising as among Romanists; that what is needed in missionary work above all things, is, not concealment of opinion, not hidden doubt, not a weak compliance with the articles insisted on by ignorant multitudes, but earnest, overwhelming faith, a faith which believes, and therefore speaks, a faith which can blow beside the walls of Jericho a "dolorous and jarring blast," before which the defences of heathenism will crumble to the ground. And until the realities of the future world occupy a far larger space in the thoughts of missionary Secretaries, and missionary Directors, the feeling of English churches towards them is not likely to improve. Meanwhile it may be noted as a symptom of the disorder complained of, that even Dr. Mullens' own book on missions, admirable man as he is, does not contain a single vigorous reference to Heaven or Hell; and that for aught that explicitly appears on his pages, replete with statistical information, the work of missions might almost be taken to refer to some movement for men's temporal salvation. A state of thought, which takes Heaven and Hell for granted, when treating on missions to the heathen, requires some reform.

2. Another reason for the decline of interest in missionary societies, will I think be found in *the failure of spiritual results*. This failure has sunk deeply into the heart of England. Public opinion has begun to form itself under other influences than missionary reports and missionary speeches. These tell but a portion of the truth. That which is favourable is generally published. That which is unfavourable is withheld. We are beginning to learn not only who are converted, but who are unconverted; not only what the missionaries think of the learned and able men of India and China, but what the learned men of China and India think of some things taught by the missionaries. We are learning to compare resources and results. We are learning to exercise imagination upon the missionary enterprise, and to understand how it must appear to the "natives" whose religions it assails.

For example, we now comprehend that the presence of our handful of European missionaries in the ports of China, bringing with them a "gospel," of which the fundamental doctrine is that all former inhabitants of China, who have been atheists or idolaters, that is, the larger proportion of that stupendous population, during many ages, and who

Digitized by Google

have died in an unregenerate condition, have gone to endless misery—strikes the educated men of China precisely as a similar message would strike the learned men of our Universities, if brought to England after ages of heathenism, by a handful of Chinese missionaries, landing in the ports of London and Liverpool. We can now understand that if it would be highly improbable that our literati would listen to so horrible a proclamation, or recognise in it the voice of a just and benevolent Deity, so it is equally improbable that it will appear Divine when taught by our missionaries at Pekin or Ningpo. And thus we come to comprehend at least some of the reasons, which, after seventy years of labour, the learned and educated classes of both India and China are as far as ever from embracing Christianity. Chinese clergymen, with a similar doctrine at London and Liverpool, could scarcely hope for greater success among ourselves.

Further, the public, after fully believing and appreciating the cheering declarations of our missionary writers as to the social revolution which is gradually advancing throughout the earth, the civilising process which is supposed to augur a favourable future for Christianity—nevertheless have learned to study the reports of *known and actual conversion* with profound disquietude, and have settled into the opinion that there must be "some awful mistake somewhere," as Mrs. Stowe expresses it, in the ideas presented for acceptance to the multitudinous Orient. In India there are 180,000,000 of people. In China there are 400,000,000 more. Now all the confessed living converts to Christianity in India, after seventy years of labour, by thirty-one missionary societies, are at this moment not much over 30,000, the far larger proportion of these being persons of the lowest rank in intelligence. Around these professed converts there is a *Christianised* population of a quarter of a million. We thank God for even such results. But it is impossible to forget what these figures mean. They mean that if you cause to pass before you all the inhabitants of India in ranks of thirty abreast, and marching a yard apart, you would have a column extending from the Land's end in Cornwall to the edge of the Caspian sea, while the converts to Christianity would be represented by one thousand of these ranks of thirty. If the whole population passed in single file before the eye, and three seconds were allowed to gaze with awful interest as to his eternal destiny upon each dusky countenance, it would require thirty years, of days of twelve hours each, to survey the whole. But the living nominal converts to Christianity from over the whole of India would pass, at the same rate of movement, in twenty-five hours. In China the known results of missionary action are even more appallingly small. You may, indeed, hope that there are thousands of Nicodemuses in both India and China, a hope at once reasonable and encouraging, and thousands more of men saved by the Spirit in their own

Digitized by Google

twilights, but surely there is some apparent deficiency in the power of modern Christianity. Where is the arm that smote Rahab? Where is the power of truth and grace that smote the philosophies and idolatries of the Mediterranean in the apostolic age, and shook the whole of Europe and Asia in a single generation? Let it not be said, it was the force of miracles that then availed. Miracles exerted an inconsiderable influence in comparison with a truth which commended itself to all consciences, a grace that commended itself to all affections, and a terror which struck like a thunderbolt from the uplifted hand of the Almighty.

It is not that we are propagating a Christianity which is half paralysed in its two chief forces of hope and fear through the perversions of a corrupted theology? We fail in thoroughly presenting God's love to the nations, a love strong enough to melt even Chinese arrogance, and to develop the belief of a personal God even among Chinese atheists, because we have encumbered Christianity with a doctrine of hell, so unjust, so indiscriminate, so hardening in its frightful propositions, that men's consciences refuse to receive it. Missionary theology cannot "commend itself to every man's conscience," because every man's conscience, whether in Europe or Asia, in proportion as it is enlightened, rejects it with horror. This is doubtless one principal reason for the general rejection of the gospel by the Brahmins, Bhuddists, and Confucianists of the east, God's love is hidden from them, and they "turn away sorrowful" from so direful a Christianity. Sir John Bowring says, in his work on Siam, that he never yet met with a learned Bhuddist who could speak with patience of the doctrine of the missionaries on the hell of England and America. Now whatever the better sort of thinking men of any nation generally reject, will not be widely received by the uneducated.

But the prevailing system of teaching among missionaries fails also in another department—fails through withholding the influence of a truth favourable to the production alike of hope and of fear. Not only does the hell preached by the missionaries fail by its unscriptural representations to awaken terror in the educated classes, since whatever you exaggerate you weaken, but it is nearly everywhere the custom with missionary societies to send out men opposed to the belief of Christ's advent to judge the nations at the destruction of the Apostacy. The plain doctrine of St. Paul, in the second letter to the Thessalonians, that the personal advent of Christ will occur for the purpose of destroying "the man of sin;" the plain doctrine of the prophets that the "Son of man comes in the clouds of heaven" for the destruction of the "fourth" empire, and of the "horn that has eyes, and a mouth speaking marvellous things;" the plain doctrine that Christ will come to punish "with flaming fire" a church that

Digitized by Google

has perverted Christianity until men can no longer believe in it, and to judge nations that persist in idolatry after due summons to repentance—this doctrine of Christ's "pre-millennial" advent, under the influence and expectation of which the gospel was indisputably spread in the first century, is systematically exploded and denied by the missionary societies, and the generality of missionaries. And here is a loss of power which may be readily appreciated. Let the gospel be preached in India and China as the message of life to the dead, as the promise of immortality in body and soul to a race sitting in darkness and death shade; let it be preached as the message of a God who is intelligibly loving, and intelligibly and justly severe; let it be preached that the "times of ignorance a gracious God winked at," *overlooked*, "but now commands all men everywhere to repent;" let the words of the angel of the everlasting gospel, in the Apocalypse, become the text of missionary preaching, "Fear God, and give glory to him, *for the hour of his judgment is come;*" and one cannot but believe that a new power will attend in the East the proclamation of Christianity. There is something so striking, so fitted to compel attention, in the warning of Christ's speedy advent to "judge the nations," to destroy obstinate worshippers of idols, to avenge the rejection of the truth, to raise the dead saints, and to establish "God's kingdom" on earth, that even languid India must lift its head to listen, and haughty philosophic China must listen awe-struck to the trumpet-blast. Christianity is a power which is designed to operate on man from before as well as from behind, through the expectation of events which shortly "shall come to pass," in the future, as well as through the study of facts accomplished in a remote past. It is emphatically a prophecy, as well as a history. But, under the prevalent system of missionary teaching, it is a gospel without that Advent of Christ, the prospect of which filled and reddened like a dawn of glory at the beginning all the eastern sky. The whole body of prophecy is supposed now to prove only that "the Lord delayeth his coming," that wisdom consists in proclaiming the doctrine of the "evil servant," and in relegating all concern for the Lord's return in the clouds of heaven to a generation that shall live at the end of the Millennium. Vain, then, are all such warnings as, "Behold, he cometh in clouds, and every eye shall see him!" for it is well understood that such an expectation of the Lord is peculiar to the "weaker brethren," and to spirits in which fancy takes the place of faith. Thus it happens that Christ's advent is banished from the thoughts of nearly the whole body of missionaries. "*Far off his coming shines*" to them, indeed, as a remote, dim nebula in the firmament of the future. Who can wonder that a Christianity so destitute of forces to win, to convince, or to appal, maintains a doubtful fight with the stiffnecked pagans of Asia! What is wanted is a doctrine that commends

Digitized by Google

itself to the reason and to the conscience of men—a love so real as to win all hearts capable of love, a terror so real, so near, and so appreciably equitable, as to shake, if it cannot vanquish, the stoutest resistance of the heathen. What is needed, is a hope of speedy victory to the church sufficient to restore the energies of the first century, and a courage founded on conviction which would engage in close conflict with the wretched positivism of Confucius. That "throneless king," as the Chinese call him, would soon, I reckon, lose such of his remaining power, before a CHRIST preached as if he were the very Jesus of the gospels—"coming again," to be the "life" of the world.

With all reverence and affection therefore, but with an earnestness which neutralizes the remembrance of personal insignificance, I implore my fellow Christians at home to reconsider in the light of Scripture the doctrinal basis and method of the missionary enterprise. I adjure, before Christ our Lord, the Secretaries and Directors of the Missionary Societies, not to continue the ban now disingenuously placed upon those who openly deny what so few in secret perfectly believe. I solemnly call upon all the Ministers of Christ who are persuaded of the untruth of the common doctrine on immortality and retribution, publicly to say so, and to confess their real convictions to the people. I earnestly invite all missionary Students in the colleges to study these questions in earnest, and not to add to the number of those who carry out to the heathen a creed which they dare not proclaim to the cultured and intelligent people of India and China.

And finally, if my voice could, by a divine providence, reach so far, I would call, with profound respect, but equal boldness, upon every honoured Missionary of the Cross around the world, to cast aside the fear of brethren abroad, or churches or directors at home, and to apply his mind, if he have failed so to do up to this present hour, to the consideration of that doctrine of LIFE IN CHRIST which is the plain and natural reading of St. John's Gospel, and St. Paul's Epistles; and next, to that doctrine of Christ's ADVENT TO JUDGMENT, which has won the conviction, in modern times, of a Bengel, a Stier, and an Alford, and a thousand more, and was unquestionably the belief of the apostles and their followers in the first age of the Christian revelation.

Digitized by Google

THE DOCTRINE OF ANNIHILATION.

DEAR SIR,

Last March you opened the *Rainbow* to the consideration of the question of Future Punishment. By this act, which must have required some faith and courage, you have laid the Church under a real obligation; for surely it is service, true service, to souls to recall them to the question, what Scripture really teaches on this momentous subject. As yet however, though you have inserted several thoughtful papers, the true answer to the question has not I think been given by you. Your correspondents, who demur to the view of endless torments, have found their escape from that terrible misapprehension of the great riddle of God's purpose, by denying what is called man's natural immortality, and by assuming that death with him as with the beasts, if he is out of Christ, is the end of existence or annihilation. Thus they escape the awful conclusion that such as depart hence unconverted live on in torment for ever and ever. As several papers in the *Rainbow* have put this view perhaps as well as it is possible to put it, will you allow me to point out, not what seems to me the full solution of the riddle, for that in a letter would be impossible, but simply one or two points which those who contend for annihilation overlook, the oversight of which appears to me to vitiate and indeed disprove their whole system.

I need not say that, upon a subject like this, little will be gained unless we are content as learners again and again to re-consider our views in the light of Holy Scripture; for if even in the things of this world all our first seeings must be more or less imperfect, much more will this be so in a question which has to do with a being like man, so complex and wondrous, who is made for more worlds than one, who is himself a world, and who, as made in God's image, is himself the greatest of mysteries. Any scoffing at brethren for a mistake on a point like this is surely out of place and inappropriate. As Augustine says, "*Illi in vos sœviant, qui nesciunt cum quo labore verum inveniatur, et quam difficile caveantur errores. Illi in vos sœviant, qui nesciunt quam rarum et arduum sit carnalia phantasmata piæ mentis serenitate superare.*" He who knows himself, and how often he has been wrong, will be the last to speak hardly of the mistakes of any.

Let me then recall attention to one or two statements which have appeared in the discussion of this subject in former papers of the *Rainbow*. I will begin with Mr. Maude and with the question, with which he opened his first paper,—"Is man by nature an immortal being?" Does not Mr. Maude see that he can never really answer this, till he defines, first, what he means by "*by nature,*" and then what he means by an "*immortal being.*" He may perhaps reply, that we all know well enough what is meant by "*by nature,*" and by an "*immortal being.*" Well—if he knows, will he kindly define it for us. A clear definition of terms may help us, and can hurt no one. First, as to "*by nature,*" what is nature? and is it fallen or unfallen nature that is referred to; or does he, when he says "*by nature,*" include both these? A precise answer to this will enable us to see more exactly what it is that we are talking about. And then, secondly, what does he mean by "*an immortal being*"? Does he mean a being who must exist for ever,

Digitized by Google

or does he mean a being who is incapable of death, that is of dissolution? The two are clearly not the same. A creature may exist for ever who is by no means incapable of dying. Every Christian must exist for ever; but a Christian is not therefore incapable of dying. As I shall show, he is capable of dying several deaths; and yet, though so mortal, he is a creature who will exist for ever. And yet Mr. Maude writes as if these two senses were interchangeable, and assumes that because man as man is a being who is mortal, that is, capable of dying, therefore he must be a being who cannot exist for ever and ever. In other words the fact that man can die is taken as a proof that man is therefore not eternal, and that he will not exist for ever. I ask, must not such want of exactness as this seriously vitiate and indeed destroy the correctness of any conclusions based on it?

But Mr. Maude seems unaware of what he has assumed. And he writes as if a complex subject could be understood by what some dear brethren call a "simple view" of it. "Simply disembarrassing themselves of the portentous assumption of a universal and uncontingent immortality," (such are some words Mr. Maude quotes with approval,) "they find themselves free to interpret the Scriptures *more naturally* than before." (Query, is it also *more spiritually*?) "Instead of obscurity, there is plainness; for they say that 'death' is death, and 'life' is life, and 'destruction' is destruction, and that 'perishing' means perishing."

And so we come to another great assumption, that "death," and "destruction," and "perishing," as used in Scripture, mean non-existence or annihilation. "Death" is death, and "life" is life, of course. But the question recurs, What *is* death? What *is* destruction? Do these words as used in Scripture mean annihilation? To assume that they do, may seem very "simple," and may satisfy those who know little of themselves and of their Bibles. But the assumption cannot stand. We have only to compare it with the Bible, and it is at once seen to be untenable. For what is death? Take any of the deaths which Scripture speaks of, and which we know. Was Adam's death, in the day he sinned, annihilation? When his spirit died to God, was this annihilation? When his body died and turned to dust, was this annihilation? Is our death in trespasses and sins annihilation? Is our death to sin annihilation? When the corn of wheat falls into the ground and dies, is it annihilation; or is St. Paul right in saying, "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die"? Do not these uses of the word prove beyond all question, that, whatever else these deaths may be, not one of them is non-existence or annihilation. Is it then the "second death" only that is annihilation? This is not Mr. Maude's argument, for his view is that death as death is always simply non-existence. But, supposing we say that the second death must be annihilation, on what grounds I ask do we assign a sense to "death" in this one place, which confessedly it has not and cannot have elsewhere? So as to "destruction." How does Scripture use the word? Take the words of the ninetieth Psalm, "Thou turnest man to destruction: again thou sayest, Come again, ye children of men." Is "destruction" here annihilation? Is it not rather that dissolution which must take place to bring us back to God's life? So again Job says, "Thou hast destroyed me on every side;" and again, "I said it: he destroyeth the perfect and the wicked." So again, "The

Digitized by Google

world that then was perished." So again, of the present heavens and earth it is said, that "they shall perish . . . . and be changed." So again both of Israel and Jerusalem it is said, that they shall be destroyed. Will they too be annihilated? So again as to the expression, "them that perish," which as every scholar knows is the same as that which is elsewhere translated, "the lost," do we not know that these "lost," though they "perish," still exist, and exist both as "lost" ones and as "saved" ones, as text on text will testify abundantly.

What can Mr. Maude reply to this? Let us see how he has replied to Mr. Strong's true assertion, that "death nowhere in the word of God means non-existence, but always a certain condition of existence." Mr. Maude's answer is, that "this somewhat bold statement raises the important and long-debated question, what was the death incurred by Adam?" Mr. Maude cannot deny the correctness of Mr. Strong's statement, which of itself overthrows Mr. Maude's theory. But he raises another question as to Adam's death. And what according to Mr. Maude was Adam's death? Here are his words:—"The death which Adam actually incurred was death in the proper and ordinary acceptation of the word, that is, the absolute termination of that creaturely existence which God at his creation had conferred upon him. The only distinction between death in the case of man, and death in the case of the mere animal, being, that while the animal dies once for all, the death of the body terminating its existence, *man dies a double death, the first affecting only the body, but the second involving the extinction of the entire being.*" Here, as elsewhere, we have to regret that Mr. Maude has not stated what he exactly means with greater precision. For instance, when he says, "Man dies a double death, *the first affecting only the body,*" does he mean that this first death is that which takes place when the body dies? Does he really overlook man's awful spiritual death—that he can be living here, as Adam was after his fall, and yet be dead in the worst death, dead in trespasses and sins? If I understand Mr. Maude's definition of Adam's death, the spiritual death in which we are through sin is no part of it; for "*the first death,*" he says, "*affects only the body; the second death involves the extinction of the entire being.*" Where then does he place man's spiritual death? Under which of his divisions can he put it? Is it part of the first or of the second death? It cannot be of the first, for "*the first,*" he says, "*affects only the body,*" Nor can it be a part of the second, for "*the second death involves the extinction of the entire being.*" Mr. Maude, I think, on reconsideration, cannot be satisfied with his statement. He must, I think, feel that it is no slight omission, in speaking of Adam's death, to have not one word to say of that spiritual death by which as soon as he sinned he was separated from God, and cut off from God's kingdom. And yet this omission is essential to Mr. Maude's theory. Had he looked at spiritual death, he must have seen that death is not annihilation. What spiritual death therefore is,—how while man is dead in spirit to God's world, he yet lives on in another world,—how he has again to die to sin in spirit, and so, by this second spiritual death, come back out of that power of darkness into which he fell when he died to God and was driven forth from Paradise,—how he lives through all these deaths, and lives on still through the death of the body, which may follow these deaths,—all this, which shows that death is not annihilation or non-existence, would

Digitized by Google

clash with Mr. Maude's theory, and therefore is omitted. And yet all this must be considered, if we would know the truth: no so-called "simple view" will solve the riddle: for man is a being, not of one world or of one life only, but made for God and in His image, and to sit in heavenly places even while yet he walks in this world.

Thus we are necessarily led to the question, What is man? Till we know this, we cannot know what death is to him. Scripture answers, "Adam was the son of God," (Luke iv. 38,) "made in His image," (Gen. i. 26, 27,) yea, even now "His image:" (1 Cor. xi. 7:) and therefore, though fallen and mortal, with a life, like its Begetter, which is and must be eternal. For God is an eternal spirit, and as that which is born of the flesh is flesh, so that which is born of an eternal spirit is eternal spirit. Adam, says St. Luke, was son of God. And though Mr. Constable may condemn Plato for believing that spite of death he should exist for ever, Paul does not judge the heathen poet for saying, "We are His offspring." Rather he builds on it the fact of what must take place after what we call death, when Christ appears to judge all men. It is this divine parentage which makes man what he is, a spirit, which though fallen has an eternal destiny; a being who can indeed become either like a devil or equal to the angels, but who is eternal, because he is a son of God.

But it may be said, this scarcely agrees with what St. Paul says as to the first or natural man, whom he contrasts with the last or spiritual. But the apparent contradiction arises from the varying senses in which the same word "spiritual" may be used,—either to mean a being with a spirit, or a being with the mind of God, and so what we call spiritual,—and also from the fact that Paul is speaking here of fallen man, and of that which "is sown a natural body," in "corruption" and "dishonour;" not of man as he was, before he fell, and died to God and lost His image. This is clear, if we think of the different senses of the word "spirit." God is a spirit; but we mean, or should mean, something very different when we speak of the Spirit, meaning the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity: and so man also is a spiritual being; but we mean something very different when we say that this or that person is spiritual; for, by spiritual, in this last sense, we mean the restoration in man under new conditions of that life which was lost at the fall, and which in God (after whose image man was made,) is seen in the Third Person of the Trinity; a life which, even before the fall, (though here I touch a great mystery,) was a procession from something else, and which, therefore, even in the deepest ground, may rightly be spoken of as "that which is not first;" because, like the Holy Ghost, it proceeds from something else, with which it is one, but from which it is also different. Those whose eyes are opened will know I speak the truth. For others it may be enough to say that man even from the first before he died to God had a "soul" or "natural" life, the outward manifestation of his spirit. This is the "living soul" which Paul speaks of, and which he says Adam was made, to contrast him with that "quickening spirit" which Christ is, and which He restores to us by regeneration. This soul-life remains in man spite of his fall, even after the life of God is quenched in man's spirit; and it is in this soul-life that since the fall we at first are all living, as if it really were our true life; unconscious of the awful death within, (though men get glimpses at times of their spirit's real state,) living on as "living souls" or "natural men," without God, and so without their true life.

Digitized by Google

Of course with a mystery like this under consideration, it is easy, if we wish it, to raise verbal difficulties. Think how one might laugh at Paul as "a mystic" for saying. "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me." How we might show the self-contradiction of saying, that he was dead, and yet he lived, and yet it was not he that lived, but Christ who lived in him. The subject is complex, not only because man is what he is, but from certain results of his fall, which add to the complexity. But the real difficulty here as elsewhere is, that the eye sees nothing but what it has learned or brings with it the power to see; proving, what we all confess in word, that God's truth needs learning, and must be lived and prayed out, not argued out. And yet the mystery is not beyond our reach, for Christ our life is the key to all, and the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God.

Let us then again look at the fall. In the day man sinned he died. What died? Not the outward body, nor the living soul or *nephesh*, though the fall affected both from that day. That which then died was the spirit, in and by which man is pre-eminently and distinctively what he is, that is a son, though now a fallen son, of God. Man, then and there, as far as his spiritual life was concerned, by sin was separated from God, and died spiritually. On this ground, and for this reason, it is that we are in Scripture said to be dead, (1 John iii. 14; Matt. viii. 22; Luke xv. 24; Eph. ii. 1, 5; Rev. iii. 1,) and need regeneration or God's life, while yet the soul and body are not dead, but yet live on, weaker indeed than they were, yet alive in this world. But death to a spirit is only exchanging one life for another, and so passing out of one spirit-world into another. When Adam therefore died in spirit, when he became "dead in sins," his spirit was not destroyed or annihilated. Like the angels that fell, the form of life was changed, just as sweet wine is turned to sour vinegar. The life which had been love became self-love, and so became devilish instead of Godlike, because it had become self-loving and selfish instead of loving. And as a result it fell at once out of that kingdom of God, which is light, into and under the power of darkness, where in spirit man remains, till he is delivered by being made partaker of the life and redemption that is in Christ Jesus. In other words, at the fall that "inner man," which was the likeness of God, was slain, (and this it is which must be "re-newed," as St. Paul says—not "*made new*" only, but "*made new again*," "in knowledge after the image of Him that created him;") and the spirit lived on, not in God's life, but in its opposite, in the fallen devilish life, in spiritual darkness, in envy, wrath, and maliciousness. Man had of course a soul or *nephesh* also, and a body too. Therefore when St. Paul prays that we may be "sanctified wholly," he asks that our "whole spirit, and soul, and body, may be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." But the spirit is the deepest root or ground of man's being; and this it is which above all is dead and needs regeneration.

Now see what takes place in regeneration, for it is a clue to the true solution of nearly every question respecting man's spirit. In our regeneration a new life, God's life, is quickened again; but the result is that there is and must be a death also, a "death unto sin," a death that is to

Digitized by Google

the fallen spirit-life.* The "old man," the "carnal mind," must die; and yet the man is not thereby annihilated; nor, though he becomes a "new man," is he therefore another person. It seems a great riddle, but it is a fact. There is a "new birth," that is the birth of a "new man," and there is the "death" and dissolution and destruction of the "carnal mind," that is the "old man." And yet, though there is this death of one old man, and the birth of another new one, the being in whom all this happens remains the same person. Nor does all this, at least at first, affect any change visible to natural eyes in the *nephesh* or soul-life, nor in the body, though it will in the end change the body also, (for our whole nature though fallen is redeemed,) and will bring the soul-life too, which is now most visible and outermost, to be innermost, and the spirit-life, which is now innermost and hidden, to be outermost, even to beam forth again out of the soul in great glory.

But at first both this birth and death work chiefly in spirit. But they are not therefore unreal. The death unto sin is as true a death as the death Adam died at the fall was a death of spirit; only the one is the exact reversal or opposite of the other. In the one as much as in the other there is or was a dissolution of the spirit-life, by which it becomes or became something different from what it is or was, (just as a drop of rain may become a hailstone, or a hailstone again become a dew-drop,) while what I may call the ground or essence is still the same, that is, in man's case, still spirit, pure spirit; not pure in the sense of freedom from evil, but pure spirit, meaning by the words only spirit. At the fall, man's spirit, till then living in God's life of love, died to God's life, for it ceased to live in love and truth; but being a spirit, for it was God's son, it was not and could not be annihilated. It only became, like that fallen spirit which had brought about the fall, a spirit fallen from love into self-love, therefore a spirit selfish, envious, proud, wrathful; in a word, devilish instead of Godlike; yet a spirit still; for God is "the God of the spirits of all," (Numb. xvi. 22; Zech. xii. 1; Deut. ii. 30; 2 Cor. vii. 1; James ii. 26,) whether fallen or unfallen. In our regeneration or conversion, the fallen selfish spirit, dead to God's life, yet living and walking according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, in the restless, devilish, fiery, self-life, by a birth again into God's life, a birth involving a death to the wretched self-life, by this "death unto sin," that is by dying to self-hood, is turned back by the quickening power of God's word or truth to live in God's life, and so in God's kingdom of light and peace and meekness. For the only way out of any world in which we are is by death to that world, even as the only way into any world is a birth into it, that is to have the life of that world quickened in us. And therefore just as the lie of the devil quickened the devil's wrathful life in man's spirit, and so poisoned and slew God's life in it at the fall, and thus brought man out of God's kingdom of light into that of darkness; so the truth of God, that is His word or gospel, quickens God's meek life again in man's spirit, and so slays the devilish life in it at man's regeneration, and thus brings man out of the kingdom of darkness back again into God's light kingdom. In each case there is a death; but neither in the one, nor in the other, though there

* See St. Paul's use of the word "sin," in Romans vii. 13—17, where sin is spoken of as a *life*.

Digitized by Google

is a death, is there annihilation. The man remains, because he is a spirit; but he is a different man from what he was before; and his spirit is in another world. Forgive my repeating this truth so often; but the Church's long sojourn in Babylon needs line upon line, here a little, and there a little, if brethren are ever to be delivered from their misapprehensions.

So much then as to the eternal nature of man's spirit—I do not say its *immortality*, because man's spirit has died to God, and being now fallen into the dark world it must die again to be delivered thence, and come back into God's light-world. God only hath immortality or undyingness. All other spirits are at least capable of death. But their dying is not the end of their existence. They die to one life, to live on in another. Thus man's very nature is itself a witness, not against his being mortal, but against his annihilation; a witness that though mortal, because he is a son of God, he is a creature, not only of time, but of eternity.

What is the bearing of all this on the generally received notion of endless punishment? Many say that to them it clearly proves that doctrine, because man's spirit-nature has already survived its death to God, and will, as countless Scriptures testify, even in the wicked survive the dying of the body. Therefo re they think it will survive as it is, that is in darkness and wrath, for ever and ever. I reply, yes, surely it will, *if it knows no further death.* But this is the very point on which Scripture has some wondrous, though as yet little-received, teaching. Scripture declares that these poor lost souls must taste the "second death." I say nothing here of this death coming under and, if I may say so, being part of the promise, "I make all things new."* I simply ask, what to such souls must this second death be? What is death? We have seen that it is only dissolution or separation; a separation from the world which until that death the spirit has lived in. So man's death to God at the fall was separation from God's light-world, in which till then man was living, involving at the same time a fall into the dark-world. And so our natural death is separation from the outward world. But at the death of the body the fallen spirit does not die: it is not therefore separated from, or delivered out of, that dark and fiery world into which it fell by disobedience: the death of the body does not deliver it out of this: nor does its being clothed upon in that awful spirit-world, at the resurrection of judgment, with its proper and appropriate body, (for every soul will get its fitting body, according to the eternal law, "To every seed its own body,") deliver it out of its fallen, wrathful, life. But shall it therefore never be delivered? What saith the Scripture? That blessed word distinctly teaches that there is a death, the "second death," even for these lost ones, and even when to the seed of sin has come at length its own body. What to such then must this death be? Again, I ask you, what is any death, but separation from the life and world which up to that death has been lived in. Why then, if by a death to sin the fallen spirit in the elect comes back by this dissolution into God's life, should you say that the same fallen, selfish, devilish, spirit, cannot be brought back to God by a death to that life in the non-elect, that is in those who are not first-fruits? And what authority have you for saying that the second death, which, if I err not, is the second

* Rev. xxi. 5—8. For a further explanation of this, I refer to my little volume on "The Second Death and the Restitution of All Things." pp. 85—86.

Digitized by Google

death the spirit dies,—its first death being to God; its second death being to God's opposite, sin,—what authority, I say, have you for asserting that this second death destroys, that is, annihilates, the fallen spirit; when you are yourself a witness that our death to sin, which is the second death our spirits have known, (for our spirit's first death was its death to God,) has through Christ changed our fallen, wrathful, devilish, spirits, and is the only way to change them back, into God's life.

It may perhaps be objected that Rev. ii. 6, and xx. 6, give a different idea of the second death. But further examination will I think show that this is not so. In Rev. ii. 6, the word which we translate, "shall not be hurt," is not the future, but the aorist; and the word we render, "by," is more exactly "out of, the second death;" evidently implying that such a soul, though conqueror, has had to do with this death. In chap. xx. 6, the statement is, that "the second death has no right or claim to those who are partakers of the first resurrection;" for such souls have already "died to sin;" and of this death it is written, "In that he died, he died unto sin once." They cannot die to sin twice. Therefore the second death has no right or power over them.

And here, if I had time, I would show you how such words as those of Hezekiah, when in reference to his "sickness unto death" and "bitterness of soul" he said, "O Lord, by these things men live, and in all these things is the life of my spirit," prove, what indeed the whole mystery of the cross teaches or should teach, namely, that it is by sorrow and anguish the fallen spirit is brought out of its selfish life, or to use Solomon's words, that "by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better." As long as any spirit lives, it remains what it was. Its *true* life, if fallen, is in dying to what it has become; and this dying is effected through a cross, that is through suffering.

One word more as to *nephesh* or soul. You are of course aware that Scripture speaks of a *soul* in God, as well as in His creatures.* But not even the rashest asserter of annihilation would I think venture to say that because the same word, *nephesh*, is used of God, of man, and of the beasts of the fifth and sixth days, therefore God's *nephesh* or soul must be, like that of the beasts, mortal. Yet this is the argument of some brethren against the doctrine of man's abiding existence. His soul is mortal, they say; that is, it will some day cease to be; because man and the beasts are each called *nephesh chaia*. The answer of course is that the nephesh or soul of any being answers to the nature of the being whose *nephesh* it is. God's nephesh is eternal, for the spirit of God is eternal. Man's nephesh is so too, I believe, because his spirit is breathed into him by God, (Gen. ii. 7,) (a thing never said of the beasts,) and because he is a son of God. But the spirit of a beast (Eccles. iii. 21) is out of the ground of temporal nature: (Gen. i. 20, 24:) its *nephesh* or soul must therefore be temporal also.

There is, however, one passage which to some may present a difficulty. It may be said, if you deny annihilation, what do you make of the words in Gen. iii. 22, "And now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the

* In all the following passages, and in many others, God is said to have a *soul*:—Isa. i. 14; Amos vi. 8; Psa. xi. 5; Lev. xxvi. 11, 30; Jer. xiv. 19; Isa. xlii. 1, and Matt. xii. 18.

Digitized by Google

tree of life, and eat, and live for ever"? Do not these words evidently involve mortality? Do they not prove that, as he was, and unless he ate of this tree, man could not live for ever? I answer, certainly these words prove man's mortality; but, as we have seen, man may be mortal, and further may actually die, both in spirit and body, and yet may live eternally. Eating of the tree of life had the power to keep man in any life which he was then living in. To eat it therefore in the fallen, selfish, devilish, life, into which he had fallen, would have been to prolong that wretched spirit-life so long as the creature could take of this tree of life. Had he therefore been left in Paradise, man might have continued a devil, lost to God, for ever and ever. Therefore the Lord sent him forth out of the garden, that He might in due time bring that spoilt life to an end; and therefore (though this only touches one part of a great question,) man in his fallen state is forbidden in self-hood or by magic arts even to attempt to re-enter the spirit-world, because his doing so in his fallen state would only hold him faster in his miserable self-hood. But this opens questions I need not follow here. I will therefore only add that to me it is not one of the least inconsistencies of those who hold the notion of man's annihilation, that holding, as they do, matter to be imperishable, spite of all its destructions, which are in fact changes, they still hold that spirit, which is the root of all matter, can be annihilated. But they know neither what they say nor whereof they affirm.

I fear I may have wearied you with so long a letter, which after all leaves untouched the wider question, what Scripture really teaches as to future punishment. But I have elsewhere called attention to this. And though some brethren are trying to "*beg off*," as our friend D. W. says, not only from "foolish questions," but from the very questions which the Spirit of Christ has asked and recorded in Holy Scripture—such questions as, "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in destruction?"—we may be sure such questions are not given us for nothing. If others "*beg off*" from them, our God and Father will not judge us for considering them. And is He not both able and willing to give us the answer to them out of His Word, if we will wait upon Him.

Yours, &c.,
ANDREW JUKES.

Digitized by Google

MILLENNIAL JERUSALEM.

BY J. T. BARCLAY, M.D., MISSIONARY TO JERUSALEM FROM AMERICA.

"Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God."—Psa. lxxxvii. 3.

"MENE, mene, tekel upharsin" was the terrific verdict denounced alike against the empire of the Chaldees, its haughty monarch, and its mighty capital, "the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency;" and upon many a splendid city of antiquity has "Ichabod" been written: but of *Jerusalem*, Jehovah says, "I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands: thy walls are continually before me. I will make thee an eternal excellency." We accordingly find that, however often doomed to utter destruction by her merciless spoilers and subverters, Phœnix like, she has always risen from her ashes in due time. For the same Almighty Being that not only suffered these chastisements to be inflicted upon the holy city, but declares in judgment for her sins, "I will make Jerusalem heaps, and a den of dragons. Zion shall be ploughed like a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house like the high places of the forest," also declares, in fulfilment of his inscrutable decrees, "Because they have called thee an outcast, saying, This is Zion whom no man seeketh after; behold I will bring again the captivity of Jacob's tents, and have mercy on his dwelling places, and the city shall be builded upon her own heap, and the palace shall remain after the manner thereof"—"it shall not be plucked up nor thrown down *for ever*."

It is strongly intimated in this comprehensive promise, that the city would not only be fully restored, but be built up according to her ancient landmarks, and that such a re-edification was literally accomplished under those great reformers and restorers, Ezra, and Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah, we have abundant evidence in the memoirs of the admirable Tershatha, and the zealous scribe. But the same Divine Being who so graciously promised its restoration, is pledged also for its enlargement beyond its ancient boundaries. And, to any one at all acquainted with the history of Jerusalem, and the topography of the city, and its environs, the truth of this declaration will abundantly appear from the following explanatory paraphrase of the prophetic text recorded (Jer. xxxi. 38—40).

38. Behold, the days come saith the Lord, that the city shall be builded to the Lord from the tower of Hananeel unto the gate of the corner.

38. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, *after the expiration of the seventy years' captivity*, that the city shall be built to the Lord, *not only* on its most impregnable foundations (in the southern quarter) *but also the less defensible wall in the north*—from the tower of Hananeel even to the gate of the corner—that portion of it most completely in ruins—from the most eastern point even to the westernmost, whence southward, the fortifications are strong—so as to occupy all the site heretofore enclosed.

Digitized by Google

39. And the measuring line shall yet go forth over against it upon the hill Gareb, and shall compass about to Goath.

39. *And not only* so, but the measuring line shall go forth yet further over against it, the former northern boundary, upon the hill Gareb, and shall compass about on that ridge and the rising ground that separates the Kedron valley from the land around the north-east part of the city, commencing at the north-west corner of Zion, and encircling a large district even around to Goath (or Golgotha), the place of a skull, that head of land that juts out into the valley of Kedron near Gethsemane like a cape into the sea.

40. And the whole valley of the dead bodies and of the ashes, and all the fields unto the brook of Kedron unto the corner of the Horse Gate, toward the east, shall be holy unto the Lord: it shall not be plucked up nor thrown down any more.

40. *And this extended wall shall embrace in its north-east portion*, the whole valley of ashes and dead bodies, as well as in the included portions of the sepulchral declivities of Kedron: and all the fields or vineyards even unto the corner of the Horse Gate, toward the east, shall be holy unto the Lord, and it (the city, at least under its original dimensions) shall not be plucked up nor thrown down any more during the present age, (though it may be repaired and beautified), but it shall remain throughout the whole millennial age in one position or another.

And to this permanence and prosperity of the holy city throughout the Millennium, Zechariah also abundantly testifies in the last chapter of his prophecy—tenth verse: "And it shall be lifted up and inhabited in her place from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the first gate unto the corner gate, and from the tower of Hananeel unto the King's wine press." The landmarks here indicated seem expressly designed to mark out the ancient capital of the Jewish kings, and purposely to exclude much of Cænopolis —the large addition made by the apostate Jews under Agrippa:—and not without special reason, for Jerusalem is yet to be surrounded by another enclosure, whose prescribed limits, of course, the city bounds must not transcend—a fact most significantly indicative of long premeditated design in superintending providence. This wall of the sanctuary, seen in vision by Ezekiel, is a square of five hundred reeds, or rather more than a mile on each side, around which extends a narrow suburban strip, thirty yards in width. If the southern boundary of this square be located so as to coincide with the southern limits of the ancient city and the western limits as closely as it can well be, there will be a considerable vacant surplus on the east and north of the city, and the temple area will fall about the centre of the enclosure, in accordance with the intimation conveyed by the prophet in his description of the holy city and vicinity. (Ezek. xlv.) The extension of the bounds of the city will render its area rather greater than any phases under which it has hitherto existed; and, with this enlargement on the north and east, still more completely will "the whole valley of the

Digitized by Google

dead bodies, and of the ashes, and all the fields, unto the brook Kedron, unto the corner of the Horse Gate, toward the east be holy unto the Lord."

Whilst the temple, seen in vision by Ezekiel, so far at least as the details are given, bears a general resemblance to that of Solomon, and the later structure erected by Zerubbabel, and repaired by Herod according to the accounts of Josephus and of the Talmud, it is yet not designed after either. In order to locate this temple and the surrounding "sanctuary" within the compass of Moriah's surface, it has been seriously proposed to change the text and substitute *cubits* for reeds, in some passages, after the example of the seventy, who took the liberty of making such an alteration, no doubt under the impression, however ill founded, that the prophet, was describing the fashion of the temple to be erected on the restoration of the Jews, after the seventy years' captivity. But as Dr. Scott well observes, "If men allow themselves to substitute one word for another in the sacred text, because the alteration would render that consistent with their systems which otherwise would be incompatible with them, there is no knowing to what lengths they may proceed. Surely it is better to acknowledge our ignorance on such abstruse subjects, than to support a favourite scheme of interpretation by giving countenance to so dangerous a measure." A sentiment surely worthy of all acceptation; and especially in reference to the portion of Scripture now under consideration, which has always been esteemed by the Rabbis so abstruse and difficult of exposition in some respects: yet the adaptation of the temple and courts described by Ezekiel to the temple mount, at least, is attended with no special difficulty, and certainly requires no such reduction as that proposed. The area of Mount Moriah is abundantly adequate to the accommodation of the projected temple and its courts. And there is certainly no kind of objection to the enclosure of the whole city within the five hundred reeds quadrilateral, constituting the boundary between the sanctuary and the profane place, provided at least, that it be remodelled and inhabited only by the Prince, the Priests, Levites, &c., in attendance on the temple service.

But while the exterior enclosure of the sanctuary described by Ezekiel is so much more extended than that of the former temples, the sacred fane itself, as well as the other corresponding structure, is but slightly larger. Their respective dimensions, indeed, are generally identical as far as recorded; but it must be remembered that the cubit used by "the man" in measuring Ezekiel's temple, is the "greater cubit," being 21·648 inches in length, while the measurements of the other temples were given in the common cubit of eighteen inches—shorter than the former by a handbreadth, which is rated at nearly four inches. (Ezek. xl. 5, and xliii. 13.) And besides this discrepancy in size, there is also a considerable dissimilarity in the internal arrangements. In the former temple there were four courts, that of the priests, that of Israel, that of the women, and that of the Gentiles, whereas in the Ezekiel temple, there are only two mentioned, the inner and the outer, or utter court. But there are many points of difference between the Ezekiel or millennial temple, and the old Jewish temple in some of its former phases, all going to show a modified ritual adapted to the millennial age.

That this temple is not to be erected before the final advent of the Messiah, is obvious from the declaration of the Lord by Zechariah (vi. 12,) "Behold *the man* whose name is the Branch: and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord."

Digitized by Google

The temple and the courts are described by the prophet as being in the midst of a square plot, called the "sanctuary," surrounded by a wall, five hundred cubits long on each side, situated in the midst of the "holy oblation," a special reservation of territory, about fifty-one miles in length, and twenty and a-half in breadth, which is assigned to the priests as their place of residence. Contiguous to the "possession of the priests," is that of the Levites, of the same dimensions, lying immediately on the north; and to the south lies the "possession of the city," the same in length, but only half the breadth of the two other portions, called also the "profane place for the city for dwelling, and for suburbs for them that serve the city." This great city, Jehovah-Shammah, is a square of ten and a-fourth miles on each side, inclusive of its suburbs, half a-mile wide, and occupies the exact middle of this last portion.

It is thus seen that these three portions united form a rectangular quadrangle of fifty-one miles on each side, quadrating with the cardinal points of the compass, which being protracted upon the map of Palestine, will be found to occupy nearly all the regions of country lying between the Mediterranean and Perea. On the eastern and western faces of this immense square the Prince is assigned his "portion," the exact quantity not specified, but doubtless including all that triangular tract between the holy oblation and the Mediterranean on the west; and the immense parallelogram extending from the eastern side of the oblation, between the new divisions of Judah and Benjamin, entirely to the border of Perea. It will be seen on inspecting the map, that the lots respectively assigned to the different tribes of Israel, differ very materially in position from the former partition under Joshua, being arranged nearly in a reversed order. And although this great oblation is situated much nearer the southern than the northern border of the newly apportioned Holy Land, yet there being only five divisions below and seven above, and the land being also much wider below than above, the divisions are nearly equal in capacity, though so widely differing in length and breadth. And this remark will apply with equal truth to the entire country in its utmost boundaries from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean in one direction, and from Mount Amanus to the Red Sea and Persian Gulf on the other, as it does to the restricted limits described by Ezekiel.

The *exact* location of the holy oblation within this district of country, though so minutely described, is not very clearly delineated, and hence cannot be determined with absolute precision. But upon the supposition that the temple is to occupy its former site, and the "very high mountain," to the south of which the great city is to be located, is Jebl Fuseidis, or Trork mountain (Beth-haccerem); its northern boundary will run due east from a point on the Mediterranean coast, about twenty miles above Jaffa, to the western declivity of the mountains of Ammon and Moab; its eastern side will be a few miles east of Jordan, on this declivity, and corner with the south line near the mouth of the river Arnon, thence crossing the Dead Sea, and passing a short distance south of Jebl Fuseidis and the ancient Jeba, will unite with the western border eight or ten miles west of Beersheba. If "the living waters that go out from Jerusalem," as recorded in the fourteenth chapter of the prophecy of Zechariah, be identical with the waters described by Ezekiel in the twelve first verses of the forty-eighth chapter of his prophecy, as issuing from

Digitized by Google

the temple (and they undoubtedly are), then must the temple be built upon its ancient foundations in the Holy City. And that the city is to be rebuilt upon its ancient site (and if not under the very meter and bounds that circumscribed it at the period of its subversion by Nebuchadnezzar, at least as extensive) is also evident. (Jer. xxxi. 38—40; Zech. xiv. 10.). That the "very high mountain," on the south of which the prophet saw the future city in vision, can be no other than Jebl Fuseidis (that celebrated station in days of yore) is sufficiently obvious from a consideration of the fact, that there is no other mountain in all southern Palestine to which this expression would apply with the least propriety. A circumstance strongly corroborative of this conclusion, is found in the fact that this mountain is situated just on the northern border of the belt of country that is to be levelled as a plain from Geba to Rimmon; and for what purpose is this rugged region to be reduced to an even surface, but as a site for the vast millennial city—Jehovah-Shammah!

This city of cities will cover an area of more than a hundred square miles, and will number its inhabitants by millions. It can be rendered very accessible by a short railway from Al Arish, Ashkalom, or perhaps still better, Gaza, reputed the very best seaport on all the coast of Syria; and the construction of a railroad to Ezion Geber, Solomon's celebrated seaport at the head of the Elanetic branch of the Red Sea, is also practicable at a small cost. The commerce of the East once flowed mainly through a channel almost identical in position with the route here indicated, between the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean. And it is doubtless destined again to become the great highway of trade and travel between the East and the West. Such a city, in such a climate, in a position so advantageous in a civil, commercial, and geographical point of view, might well claim to be the mistress of the world, when Judea shall have again become inhabited by its rightful owners. But still it is to its neighbour, a few miles to the north, the city of the Great King—the joy of the whole earth—that this supremacy is assigned in the coming age by him who is Governor among the nations, the King of kings and Lord of lords.

We learn from the prophecy of Zechariah (xiv. 8), that at the coming of the Lord, two most copious perennial streams of water shall burst forth from Jerusalem; one going forth towards the Mediterranean, or "hinder sea;" and the other towards the former or Dead Sea, developed apparently by the great earthquake: and as this earthquake, which shall rend Mount Olivet asunder and produce a "very great valley" running eastward, apparently for the purpose of conveying one of the life-giving streams to the parched desert below, will probably effect other physical changes in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem as well as in the depression of land from Geba to Rimmon; it will be useless to speculate as to the course the western stream will pursue, though it would seem from the third chapter of Joel, v, eighteenth, in connexion with the declarations of Ezekiel (xlvii. 1—12), that the course of the eastern river is very definitely marked out, though there is no valley in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem known at the present day by the name there designated Shittim. Wadyanek-Nazel, however, would seem to be indicated as the most natural channel, and may originally have been called Shittim.

Digitized by Google

We are not informed *where* the healing stream bifurcates, if indeed there be only *one* source of the waters, or in what part of the Temple enclosure, or of the city, the second fountain arises. If there be *two* distinct sources, Ezekiel only measures and describes one; but Zechariah clearly indicates the existence of two, and inasmuch as that which flows eastward arises on the east of the holy house, that which flows westwardly probably arises west of that building. If so, it must necessarily fall into the Tyropæon; and if left to itself, would naturally be carried down Wady-en-Nair into the Dead Sea, unless it be conducted out of it westwardly by an aqueduct, or else the earthquake divert it in the same direction, either by opening a new channel, or by blocking up or elevating some portion of the present Wady-en-Nair. It would be perfectly practicable, with very little labour, to conduct a stream issuing from the Temple area to the region of the future Jehovah-Shammah, by a short serpentine canal conformed to the requirements of the ground about the upper portions of the Tyropæon, Mount Zion, Hinnom, etc., situated as the ground now is. This western stream may thus readily be conducted to the great city, and thence, after irrigating a large portion of the arid region of southern Judea, enter the Mediterranean at El-ansh, or by any of the numerous valleys that empty into the Mediterranean. We have no positive information as to the size of *this* river, but if it be as large as that emptying into the Dead Sea, it may be rendered very serviceable not only for the irrigation of a large district of country, but for internal boat navigation. If it be true that the desert of Arabia was once an inland sea or lake, and is still depressed below the level of the sea, may it not be refilled either from the sea or by this river? It will be recollected that while Jerusalem is 2,927 feet above the Dead Sea, its elevation above the Mediterranean is only 2,610 feet, and that Jehovah-Shammah will be much more depressed.

The waters that issue out eastward seem to undergo no increase in passing from the altar through the surrounding buildings, nor, perhaps, for a further distance of six hundred yards. But, at this point at the least, the fountain becomes a stream ankle-deep; twelve hundred yards from the sanctuary, it becomes knee-deep; at a distance of eighteen hundred yards it is found to be loin-deep; and when it is last measured, at a distance of two thousand four hundred yards (more than one and a-third mile) from the wall of the sanctuary, by which time it has passed through the cleft in Mount Olivet, it has become more than chin-deep, "risen waters to swim in, a river that could not be passed over." Whether the river becomes still deeper, and what is its width, we are not informed; but it is probable that it receives no furthnr increment. Its gradual augmentation thus far at regular intervals of one-third of a mile, seems to be due to subterrannean accessions received from the rent bowels of Mount Olivet.

Should this river rush immediately down this valley into the Dead Sea, it would produce a succession of rapids, cascades, and cataracts unequalled in all the world; for the distance being only about fifteen or twenty miles, and the difference of altitude nearly four thousand feet, the rate of descent could not be less than an average of two hundred feet per mile, or one foot in twenty-six—a fall of four thousand feet in twenty miles! while the entire fall in the Mississippi, through its whole course of two thousand miles, is only one thousand five hundred and seventy-five feet.

Digitized by Google

What inconceivable power for the propulsing machines! What teeming luxuriance must cover the banks of this fertilising and vivifying stream, and especially if the waters be made to meander along the declivities of the once frightful, barren, and desolate desert! How surpassingly beautiful the evergreen landscape in which this life-giving river sweetly meanders, where "grow all trees for meat, whose leaf fadeth not, neither shall the fruit thereof be consumed: bringing forth new fruit according to his months, the fruit thereof for meat, and the leaf thereof for medicine." (Ezek. xlvii. 12.) Then, indeed, will the wilderness and the solitary place be glad, and the desert rejoice and blossom as the rose. These are the gladdening waters of which the exulting psalmist spoke in vision, "There is a river, the streams of which shall make glad the city of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the most High." (Psa. xlvi. 4.)

We are not positively told that the waters issuing to the west will possess those wondrous properties that characterise the eastern river; but it is altogether a legitimate inference that they will be similarly endowed. And if, on the banks of this refreshing and fructifying stream, adorned with their health-imparting and life-giving trees, the highway of holiness shall lead from Jehovah-Shammah to the Holy City and Temple, through the desert of Tekoah, then really become "an house of prayer for all nations," what a paradisaical avenue would conduct the millenarian pilgrim up to the house of the Lord! Thus shall "the ransomed of the Lord return and come to Zion, with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads." "And it shall come to pass . . . . in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the law from Jerusalem." (Isa. ii. 2. 3.)

"See the streams of living waters,
Springing from eternal love,
Well supply thy sons and daughters,
And all fear of drought remove.
Who can faint while such a river
Ever flows their thirst to assuage!
Grace which, like the Lord the giver,
Never fails from age to age.

Great as are the temporal blessings of the millennial age, greater by far are its spiritual blessings. Satan being then bound, and the evidences of the Lord's presence ever before their eyes, who can form even the faintest conception of the blessedness and splendour of the glorious era when "the whole earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea"! For "wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times, and strength of salvation."

The waters of the Dead Sea would not only be "healed," but, doubtless, much increased in depth, and extended in length; for the latter rain being also fully restored, would form, in concurrence with these waters, far more than a counterbalance to the evaporation by which this mysterious sheet

Digitized by Google

of water is now restricted to its narrow limits; and being walled in by perpendicular cliffs towering to the height of one or two thousand feet on each side; while its breadth would not be much increased, its length must necessarily be greatly extended, particularly towards the south. It would seem, even from existing indications, that its length was formerly much greater than at present; and such a copious accession would, doubtless, cause its permanent outflow into the Red Sea, thus effectually sweeping away its bitter waters.

Very considerable geological changes will doubtless be produced by the great convulsions that accompany the subsidence and levelling of the tract of country lying between the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea, under the parallels of latitude separating Jeba and Rimmon; and one highly beneficial result, amongst many remarkable consequences of the earthquake, will no doubt be a literal verification of a prophecy of Isaiah (xxxv. 6, 7), that has heretofore been regarded as exclusively figurative: "In the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water." How glowingly is the prosperity of the land and nation of Israel set forth by the prophet, when Judah and Israel shall have been restored and brought in complete subjection to their Prince, David the Beloved, *i.e.*, the Prince-Messiah. (Isaiah lx.)

But the most interesting, and perhaps the most marvellous circumstance attending the millennial condition of Jerusalem, remains yet to be mentioned. We are informed by Isaiah in the fourth chapter of his prophecy, that "when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughter of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof, by the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning . . . he will create upon every dwelling-place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day and the shining of a flame of fire by night; for upon all the glory shall be a covering. And there shall be a tabernacle for a shadow in the day-time from the heat, and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from storm and from rain" (verses 3—6) . . . "The Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee, and the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." (Isai. lx. 1—3.) "The sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee, but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. Thy sun shall no more go down, neither shall thy moon withdraw itself; for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended: thy people also shall be all righteous, and they shall inherit the land for ever. The branch of my planting, the work of hands, that I may be glorified. A little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation; I the Lord will hasten it in his time." (lx. 19—22.) Moreover the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold on the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people and healeth the stroke of their wound." (xxx. 26.) "Then the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before thy ancients gloriously." (xxiv. 23.) From these passages it would appear that when the Lord shall again record his name in his dwelling-place in Zion, for "this is the hill which God

Digitized by Google

desireth to dwell in, yea, the Lord will dwell in it for ever,"* there will be revival, on a magnificent scale, of the "glory of the Lord," as it anciently rested over the tabernacle in the wilderness, a "pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night," such a manifestation of Deity, perhaps, as was seen in Eden! May it not be to this Shechinah, thus overshadowing the holy city as a glorious luminary canopy that the astonishing change of climate is to be ascribed? And need any more direct divine interpretation be invoked in explanation of the wonderful effects wrought on the whole vegetable and animal kingdom in relation to the fertility of the soil, the domestication of destructive members of the forest, the transmutation of poisonous reptiles into innocent creatures, and the prosperity, happiness, and longevity of its inhabitants? Should any other influence be deemed necessary, we have it without inconsiderately ascribing these wonderful changes to such an alteration of the axis of the earth as would make the ecliptic and equator coincide. Has not the Lord promised, in speaking of this very matter, as pourtrayed in the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, that he will make a covenant with the beasts of the field, and the fowls of heaven, and the creeping things of the ground? (Hos. ii. 18.) There is no calculating the wonderful consequences that would result from the alteration of electrical, thermal, and magnetic agencies, to say nothing of celestial light from the overhanging golden city in a meteorological and climatic point of view. And who can divine the wonderful change that will be wrought, not only on man, but on the brute creation also, and, indeed, even on the vegetable kingdom, by the life-giving stream that flows from the oracle of God! Would it be any marvel that the carniverous beasts should not only be herbiverous, by feeding upon the vegetation growing upon the banks of this marvellous water, but have their entire nature changed into something like what it probably was when Adam gave them names in the garden of Eden! If the juice of the grape, when fermented, is capable of producing an effect so astonishing upon man—mentally, physically, and morally—is there anything unreasonable in the supposition that the water of this river, and the vegetable production on its banks, which are not only healing but life-giving, should effect such a change even in ravenous beasts and venemous reptiles? Certainly not; "*because their waters they issue out of the sanctuary,*" a fact to which the prophet directly ascribes their wonderful properties. If the properties of the nitrous oxide, or exhilarating gas, are so different from that of the atmosphere, though formed of the same elements, and differing only in their relative proportions, why should not a slight change in the waters of the sanctuary be adequate to the production of all the effects ascribed to this millennial "*aqua vitæ*"?

* "Thus saith the Lord, *heaven is my throne* and *the earth is my footstool;*" we are not therefore to infer from these and similar passages that Jehovah will dwell in Jerusalem in any other manner than by delegation and the symbol of his presence. Nor do the Scriptures, rightly construed, intimate that the Saviour will actually *dwell* upon the earth *in propria persona*, as contended by many; or that he will ever be seen on earth except at Jerusalem. That, however, there is every reason to believe he will occasionally, and perhaps statedly, visit in personal manifestation to receive the homage and adoration of his earthly subjects. The throne of God and of the Lamb, where of course is the real seat of the divine government, is the heavenly Jerusalem above, the abode of the redeemed, whence as kings, and priests, and the partners of his throne, they will reign with Christ *over* the earth for ever and ever.

Digitized by Google

There is no aspect in which the millennial age can be regarded that is not richly suggestive of the most pleasing and profitable theme of contemplation. Satan being bound, and man brought into complete subjection to Jesus Emmanuel, the whole creation, which had hitherto groaned in travail on account of man's sins, is vocal with praise, "*the times of the restitution of all things*" having now arrived. Who that has a heart to feel can refrain from praying and labouring for a "consummation so devoutly to be wished!"

LETTERS ON THEMES OF DEEPEST MOMENT.

Sextus Calpurnius to his dearest Mother, greeting.

III.

A FEW days after my last letter was sent off to Italy, there might have been seen two horsemen, well mounted, leaving the city of Cæsarea by its eastern gate. The sun was at its winter solstice, and the air was fresh and invigorating. The one, in the military garb of a Roman captain, had but lately landed on this shore from a protracted voyage from his far-off home; the other, though not a native of this country, yet called it his fatherland, and was familiar with every hill and dale; and as they rode along pointed out each spot of historic fame. These were Jehoiada, the venerable Israelite, and your own Sextus, listening with eager interest to his eloquent friend, and ravished with the rich landscape through which lay their north-eastern course. To him that had so lately escaped the stormy wind and tempest, any land journey would have proved a most welcome change, but to cross these wooded hills and glades, verdant even at this season with evergreens, was refreshing indeed. But it was the companionship of such a friend that lent its peculiar charm to this fascinating journey. It is questionable whether southern Italy, or even Helvetia herself, can present more picturesque scenery than does this tract of country. Soon you reach the plain of old Jezreel; there is the vale of Hadad Rimmon, where a bereaved nation wept for their very best of kings slain at the neighbouring Megiddo. Soon Tabor rises before your view, like a semi-sphere, some twelve hundred feet above the place. As it is inaccessible on all sides except the north, we skirt the western side and ascend by a gentle circuitous path, and in an hour reach the plateau which crowns the summit. Here are our *castra* pitched in a most admirable position for commanding the surrounding country, and doubtless will be made available in any future invasion of this country by our armies. A rampart thrown across the northern side must render this stronghold of Tabor one of the most secure, of which any commander would be proud. But I forget that these strategical details must be of little interest to one of your unwarlike sex. Of far greater interest would be the glorious panorama seen from the heights of Tabor's turrets. One ought to have the pen of my ready writer, Jehoiada, to set forth its glories. Although

Digitized by Google

it is winter, yet this very circumstance only lends its peculiar attraction to the scene. To the south-west is the great plain which we have traversed, blackened by those mountains whose fastness we had threaded. Those defiles might well be called in Hebrew minstrelsy, "valleys of the shadow of death." To the south is the grand rugged Gilboa, where Israel's first king and his noble son came to an ignominious end. 'Twas on that fatal spot where the royal minstrel composed that funeral dirge to his king and his friend—that noble ode which my dear father loved so well, and which he taught me to appreciate so highly. You will be gratified, my dear mother, to hear that Jehoiada compliments me highly on my proficiency in Hebrew literature. The compliments of such a man are no mean praise—no mean flatteries of false adulation. To read over in my Hebrew rolls the incidents enacted in these scenes which we are traversing will be delightful indeed! But pray forgive this digression.

To my mind incomparably the finest prospect from Tabor is to the northward. Before rise the mountains of Galilee, and at the back of these far away is the mighty Lebanon, with its crown of snow; to the north-east is the stately Hermon, whilst on the other side of the magnificent landscape is Mount Carmel. The well-practised eye of Jehoiada caught a glimpse of the Lake of Gennessareth, but I should not have detected it had not my particular attention been attracted towards it. The Jews call this lake a *sea*, but we who have bathed in the far more extensive lakes of northern Italy and Helvetia should call it a lake.

Not far from the base of Tabor is the little Town of Nain; I had almost called it a village, but my Israelite friends even honour it with the name of a *city*, and truly Nain shall be held in honour among the generations yet to be born.

Although our actual residence during our stay in this neighbourhood was in the castra on the hill, yet we spent much time in Nain: for here Jehoiada had many friends. One evening we dined at the house of one Simon, a Pharisee. For your Sextus, being a Gentile, there was set a repast at a separate table. Around the spacious upper room, in which the banquet was spread, were couches arranged along the walls; on one of these I and my Gentile centurion reclined behind these fastidious Jews, who would not eat with one of our Gentile race. Jehoiada begged me to overlook this seeming discourtesy *for his sake*, saying that his friend Simon was of the straitest sect of his religion, a Pharisee.

On our way up the hill of Tabor, Jehoiada informed me that he had enjoyed the supreme delight of dining at that very table with the Shiloh himself; that during the entertainment a courtesan of the town, who had heard the Shiloh teaching in the street, followed him in unobserved; and sat on the spot where I had been sitting that evening; that this poor woman had ventured in to listen to the conversation of the Great Teacher —that suddenly the whole company present were startled by loud sobbings; when lo! behind the reclining Shiloh was this woman kneeling, sobbing as though her very heart would burst—that her tears rolled upon his feet, and she wiped them dry with her dishevelled hair; immediately the whole chamber was redolent with the scent of most fragrant ointment. Jehoiada said it was spikenard from the East, of the most costly kind, and must have cost a considerable sum of money. Simon was in a state of blank astonishment, which soon gave place to the utmost indignation; for he

Digitized by Google

loathed the sight of such a wretch as this woman had been. Nay, he even began to question the character of his Divine guest, for not knowing who the woman was; but the Shiloh amazed the host and all his guests yet more by pronouncing her many sins to be forgiven. "Then," said my dear old friend, "I said within myself, who can forgive sins but Jehovah alone, against whom they have been committed? but, O my Sextus, I have since discovered, to my joyous experience, that wondrous man, even Jesus Emmanuel hath power on earth to forgive sins. He is the Anointed One, the Great High Priest, to pronounce our sins remitted; nay, he is even more, he is God himself that pardoneth iniquity, for he hath pardoned *even me.*" I cannot understand such language, my dearest mother; but the fervour with which our dear friend spoke, attested his sincerity: and his well-known character for intelligence and sobriety of temperament will be a sufficient assurance that he is uttering what his heart feels are the words of truth and soberness. Jehoiada is often talking to me of this το καλου this chief good of man.

The other day Jehoiada asked me to accompany him to the home of another of his friends at Nain: she was a widow, and lived with an only son. I was fascinated with the sweet address of this aged lady. I felt that she too knew much about the το καλου, of Jehoiada. In course of our conversation, my friend asked her to tell me what she knew of the Shiloh. With a face radiant with delight she then told me this wondrous tale —"My son was dead and is alive again!" I looked at each of them in blank amazement, but each assured me that it was indeed true. I went out into the street, hardly knowing what I was doing. I approached a group of persons, and asked them if they knew the widow whose house I had just quitted. They at once exclaimed, "Yes, indeed, she is known through the whole region round about: for her only son was dead, but is alive again." Then another said, "He was being carried out to burial, and we were all following the bier, when we were met near yonder gate by Jesus the Nazarene. He was moved at the sight of our deep sorrow, asked us to stay a moment, then, before we had time to think, he cried out, 'Young man, I say unto thee, Arise!' That is the very young man, who is now coming towards his mother's home." Another of the little group then broke in, "I was a leper once, a leper of foulest type: but Jesus spoke but the word, 'Be thou clean!' and my flesh returned to me like that of a little child." Then another said, "I was blind, I could not discern a single object, but was led about by a dog to beg the charities of an unfeeling world: I asked one day of some passers-by, when one of them stopped and greeted me so tenderly, and said, 'Silver and gold we have none: but wilt thou receive thy sight?' I replied, 'Art thou he that didst raise the widow's son?' He answered, 'Even he, dost thou trust in me?' I cried, 'Lord, I believe;' and in a moment scales fell from my eyes, and I see." "Yes," said another, "and the first use that our neighbour made of his recovered sight was to bring the sick, the palsied, the paralytic, to Jesus; and they were all made whole." I at once returned to my friend in the widow's house, overpowered with this manifold testimony to the divine mission of Jesus the Nazarene. There, rising to welcome me, was the very youth who had been recalled from the realms of Pluto. I gazed at him as though he were a supernatural being. He took me by the hand, endeavoured to compose my mind, and then talked to me so sweetly of

Digitized by Google

Jesus Emmanuel! It did indeed seem as though he had been recalled to a higher stage of life, of holiness, of love. I longed to ask him of the dark secrets of the future life; but I could not divert the sweet flow of his discourse about the loving Jesus: and Jehoiada has since told me that on this point he has ever maintained an inviolate reserve.

What marvels have I heard during these last few days! Surely the golden age is returning—the age for which a whole world is sighing.

We did not stay very long at Tabor; for my duties urged me on to the new city of Tiberias. It is an entirely Roman city, and many from Italy and Greece are settling here for purposes of commerce; but it will be a long time ere it rises to much importance, even though Herod should establish his petty court here. Not only is the city dedicated to Tiberius Cæsar, our reigning Emperor, but there is positively a temple erected in its forum to the honour of the living Cæsar, and our Roman eagle spreads its outstretched wings over the gateway. Can sycophancy succumb to lower depths of degeneracy? *O mores! O pudorem!* How degenerate are my fellow-countrymen! for sad to relate they are not wanting who are servile worshippers at the shrine even of Tiberius Cæsar. The Jews feel this outrage most sensitively; and even if their king had not appeared, I feel assured that our Roman tenure of this province cannot be of very long duration.

Though the situation is well-chosen, and everything is done on Herod's part to create and advance its prosperity, yet I think that it is a fatal mistake to build these Italian cities in this peculiar country; and these shrines of servile flattery must estrange the allegiance of these patriotic Jews.

After a few days I had arranged all my military affairs to my entire satisfaction, so we chartered one of those little fishing smacks peculiar to this lake, and sailed down the romantic shore, passing several villages, of a most charmingly varied landscape. We soon arrived at the busy town of Capernaum. It reminds me very much of our Brundusium, especially as we approached it from the water. The shore is here a flat beach between two projecting headlands, and upon it are boats of different sizes drawn up, high and dry; and the burley, brawny, sun-tanned fishermen sit upon them, some mending their huge drag-nets, others cooking on their fire of coals kindled on the shore. The town of Capernaum is on the cliff, and very pleasant is some of the residences of the better class of Galileans, commanding views of the lake. The old master of our little ship was very communicative, and I had much talk with him about Jesus. He assured me that he knew the Great Teacher well: and as we approached the southern headland, he pointed out a gentle slope towards the sea, reaching to the water's edge, on which had stood tier above tier, thousands from the lake villages, whilst Jesus talked to them from the deck of a ship. I asked him if he had ever heard this great Teacher; he replied that he had frequently heard him, that he taught as one having authority, and not as the Scribes, who were disputing, putting forth objections, and never answering them with any degree of certainty. The old man told me that on one occasion he had joined a dense crowd who had flocked out to Bethsaida, at the north-eastern angle of this lake. On a large common, at a little distance from this village, were assembled five thousand men, not including women and children. They were ranged in lines of fifty each, and twelve of his immediate disciples were ordered to make a repast for this immense multitude. They looked at one another

Digitized by Google

in speechless amazement, but their Master took five barley cakes and two small fishes, which a lad had brought with him, and looking up to heaven he prayed, then broke the bread and divided the fishes, and the whole ate of them. I looked at my informant in utter amazement, when Jehoiada, who overheard the conversation, assured me that he too was present; that he was very intimate with two of the disciples, who are natives of Cana, Nathaneal Bar-Tolmai and Simon, who had been of the sect of the Zealots; that these disciples had related to him the conversation of Jesus on this occasion. "And I," said our shipmaster, "am extremely well acquainted with four others of these disciples—the two sons of Zebedee, and the two sons of Jonas; and one of these, Andrew, told me that he expostulated with Jesus and said, what are these few cakes and these two fishes among so many?" "I can assure you," resumed the old man, "we all began with good hearty appetites, for the day was far spent, and we left our homes very early." "Yes," said Jehoiada, "and when the banquet was over, the Master ordered that all the broken meat and bread should be gathered together, for though by his power he can create such an abundance, yet he will not have a single fragment wasted." You remember, my dear mother, those baskets (*cophini*) which the Jews of Rome and Puteoli carry about with them. I find that the basket is to preserve their food from pollution, and the hay which they carry in it is to serve as a pallet whereon to lie. Now each of the twelve disciples had his basket, and each filled it with fragments. I had these wondrous tidings corroborated over and over again by those who had partaken of this Divine bounty. But Jehoiada most sagely remarked to me, "Why are you so amazed? Does not Jehovah far more abundantly multiply the corn, the olives, the grapes, &c., upon a thousand hills?" Then he chanted forth a fragment of a noble Hebrew melody—

"That our garners may be full, affording all manner of store:
That our sheep may bring forth thousands, yea, ten thousands in our streets:
Happy is the people that is in such a case;
Yea, happy is the people whose God is Jehovah."

Sweetly did the rich music of his fine voice sound upon the waters as we glided along, and when we came to the chorus it was taken up by the whole crew, and Sextus Calpurnius has caught the sweet refrain—

"Yea, happy is the people, whose God is Jehovah."

On reaching Capernaum, we at once repaired to the house of Leonatus. He welcomed me most heartily, for he had heard from Jehoiada that I was to be with him. Oh, how he delights to talk of our lamented Statilius, and of his friend's friend, my own most honoured father! It seems that Jehoiada has written of me to him in terms of no faint praise; that I have succeeded to my father's piety, as well as to his post of captain of Augustus' Band. Although Leonatus and I have not known each other for many days, yet there is firm friendship sprung up between us. In fact, brotherly love would seem to be the inseparable accompaniment of a reception of the teachings of the Anointed One. Leonatus is all that I could have expected him to be; an active, brave, dauntless soldier, a most skilful officer, a most effective disciplinarian; the delight, the *dulce decus* of his well-ordered troops. I was deeply moved yesterday when he produced from his repository those very fragments of the Scriptures written

Digitized by Google

out for my dear father by Eliezer, the scribe of Bethany, which things most precious Statilius bequeathed to him on his bed of death. I intend to offer him a roll of the grand odes of Isaiah for these same, for, oh! how precious will they be as a gift to his best of mothers from Sextus Calpurnius.

Leonatus has introduced me to the chief ruler of the synagogue, which he built at his own cost for the use of the Jews; his name is Jairus, another noble son of Israel, of whose friendship I shall ever be proud. It is in this synagogue that the Shiloh most frequently worships and teaches on those happy Sabbaths which he spends at Capernaum. O Capernaum! thrice and four times happy, exalted to the heavens by these thy privileges!

And now, my dear mother, prepare your mind to read yet another of these most astounding marvels of Jesus: it was enacted in the very household of this Jairus. Leonatus kindly invited the ruler, his wife, and little daughter, to dine with Jehoiada and me: Jehoiada sat with these guests at a separate table, according to the Jewish custom. Next to Jehoiada sat the lovely Miriam, the lovely girl of about fourteen summers, the joy of her parents' hearts. These loving parents introduced her to me as doubly theirs, for she had been born to them a second time. "How can these things be?" I cried, with an incredulous stare, doing violence to all my innate good breeding. The mother then related this wondrous tale. "Our dear daughter *died!* yes, this our dearest Miriam died! 'tis somewhat more than a year ago. Every preparation was made for the funeral; the hired minstrels were in attendance, chanting the funeral dirge. While she was yet alive, her father went to fetch Jesus. They were long in returning; not only did my impatience make them seem to be long, but the Shiloh was delayed by the thronging crowds, and by a miracle which he wrought by the way. When they reached our house our darling was dead! I sent to tell the father that it was *too late.* We of course, had given up all hope, and I was abandoned to grief. But Jesus said to me as he entered the house, "Fear not, only trust in Me; she shall be restored." He then dismissed the minstrels with their purchased mockery of woe He assured them their was no need of their services in our house. They all laughed him to scorn, knowing that our Miriam was indeed dead. Dead, indeed! But Jesus came to the bed on which the corpse was lying, and, as though Miriam had only been sleeping, He took her by the hand, and said to her with such tenderness as if he were addressing a living invalid, "My darling, arise!" and she arose alive, well, in as robust health as if she had never been sick! and yet she had been wasted with months of sickness. Yes, there she sat in most perfect beauty. I thought whilst I gazed upon her that on her recall to life the elixir of immortality had been made to course through her veins."

What a letter of marvels must this prove to my dearest mother; and yet it is her own son that is writing these wondrous details! Nothing do I describe but that which is most strongly attested.

Pray read this without any reserve to all our old friends, who delighted so much in my father's letters, and whom you describe as taking equal interest in those of his son.

Jehoiada salutes you. Salute Lentulus, Gabirius; salute Statilius the younger.

May you live and be happy!

A. U. C., 786, *Id. Jan.*

Digitized by Google

THE LIVING WATERS.

(Ezek. xlvii. 1—12; Zech. xiv. 8.)

"IT is finished," said the Saviour; earthly life and death were over,
He had died, and He had risen, and once more He meets His own;
Soon to leave them, and, ascending to the presence of Jehovah,
Seat Himself in expectation on His heavenly Father's throne.
One last blessing and the sorrowing from their risen Lord are riven;
While their hearts to the departed with a deep devotion burn,
"Men of Galilee, why stand ye sadly gazing up to heaven?
This same Jesus, who has left you, in like manner shall return."
On this very Mount of Olives—which of earth the holiest place is,
Which remains to us unaltered 'mid a thousand earthly jars,
Where, most boldly, we may venture to upraise our loving faces
To the sinless worlds around us in the sisterhood of stars—
On this very Mount of Olives, in His day of kingly power,
Shall His feet that trod so patiently earth's dreary pathway stand;
With no little band of followers, as in his departing hour,
For the thousands of the glorified attend at His right hand!
When His enemies are vanquished, and His sword is red with slaughters,
And earth's kingdoms are the kingdoms of our God and of His Son,
From Jerusalem shall flow in limpid streams the Living Waters,
To the Great Sea and the Dead Sea through the seasons they shall run.
And these Living Waters, flowing in the might of new creation,
Shall approach the dreary region upon which the curse was poured,
And, with healing strength o'ercoming all its ancient desolation,
Make the valley of the Jordan as the garden of the Lord.
From the sanctuary flowing, spreading peace and spreading healing,
Through the desert, and the smitten, and the parched land, is their way:
And, the onward stream new beauties and new blessings fast revealing,
Sad Judœa regains her verdure, when beneath the gentle sway.
'Tis no vision of the dazzled, 'tis no dream of the hereafter,
Which, a calmer reason sifting, can with certainty refuse:
No vain paradise, which well provokes the sceptic's sneer or laughter—
'Tis a stately picture taken from God's telescopic views.
On high places He makes rivers, and with streams he fills the valley,
The parched wilderness is water, and the dry land yields her springs;
Whatsoever the Lord pleased *that did He.* I ask you, "shall He
Not perform His sovereign pleasure in all *future* earthly things?"
Of the coming joys and glories not a single jot or tittle
Can deceive us in fulfilment, can as earthly glories fail;
Th ough we see but very dimly, we can sometimes see a little,
When the hand of inspiration lifts a corner of the veil.
Come then, Lord, and, with thy People in Mount Zion dwell for ever,
While Thy Church shall dwell triumphant in Jersalem above;
And satisfy our longings, where no cloud or sin can sever,
With the river of Thy pleasures, and the riches of Thy love!

R. BROWN, JUNR.

Digitized by Google

EARTHQUAKE BUNDLE.

WHO ever heard of such a thing as an "*earthquake bundle?*" I saw a letter a few days since written by a lady living in South America, near the place where a terrible earthquake had just thrown down the houses built of mud and cane, so that what was a few weeks ago a thriving city, is now a heap of dust. It had lifted the ocean waves so that a great ship of war with dragging anchor was carried hither and thither, and set down far inland, where it must remain while its timbers endure, as a monument of God's power. Rocks were rent asunder, the earth opened, and hot, sulphurous water boiled up about the feet of those who were flying from falling houses. The earth continues to rumble and tumble every day, and the inhabitants of that region lie down at night not knowing but that without an instant's warning, their houses will be thrown down, and they forced to fly to the mountains. They keep a bundle on their beds with a full suit of clothing and cloak or shawl, so that they can snatch it and fly, for the earthquake gives no time to unlock closets, open trunks, or collect scattered articles. This is called an *earthquake bundle.*

What would tempt me to live in a country where such a sad reminder must daily meet the eye as one lies down to rest, thought I, on reading this account from the pen of a young friend, born and bred among the granite hills of New England. Though we encounter stern winter winds and snows, and are deprived of tropical fruits and soft balmy breezes, the earth is firm beneath our tread, the ocean waves are stayed by the Almighty hand that made them, and we lie down in peace and security. Just then my eyes glanced at a prophetic description found in the sixth chapter of Revelation, so like, and yet infinitely more fearful than the terrible scenes lately described in South America. A time when the "chief captains, mighty men, and bond men hide themselves in the dens and rocks of the mountains." Woe be to those found without a robe of righteousness to cover their naked souls from "the wrath of the Lamb" in that fearful day. That hour will surely come and leave no time for preparation. When we lie down at night, though not forced to have a gloomy, ominous earthquake bundle lying on our beds, we are warned by the events of every day to obtain a robe of righteousness from our blessed Saviour to protect us from the fiery indignation of the final Judge, and the sudden and everlasting death of the soul, an evil which the most terrible earthquake is powerless to inflict, if our peace is made with Heaven and our sins forgiven.

Our Saviour said: "Be ye also ready." Learn of the inhabitants of the earthquake region not to lie down at night unprepared for the final scene that may come at any hour.

The earthquake may usher its prepared victim into everlasting glory, but woe be to those who refuse to hear the Saviour say: "Watch, therefore; for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh."—*N. Y. Observer.*

Digitized by Google

Correspondence.

LAPSED PROPHECIES.

DEAR SIR,—Allow me to trouble you with a few lines on the subject of "*Lapsed Prophecies.*" This subject has been brought forward once or twice in the *Rainbow* by some of your correspondents, and appears to me to be founded on a mistaken view of the mind of God. There can be no such thing as a lapsed prophecy in the word of eternal truth. There may be *promises* made on certain conditions, and then held back when those conditions have not been fulfilled. But to foretell a thing, and not to accomplish it, would be contrary not only to the dignity, but even to the faithfulness of God. Let it be observed, that in the last prophecies of Ezekiel there is not one word spoken as to *conditions*. The prophecies are straightforward, and *absolute*, without any condition being annexed to them. There is not a word said as to the possibility of their failure; therefore the truth of God requires absolutely that they should not lapse or fail. Even the conditional promises made to Israel have none of them lapsed. They are merely deferred till a future time, when Israel shall "look on him whom they have pierced." How then can we suppose that an *unconditional* prophecy can lapse, when even *conditional* prophecy has not lapsed?

This mistake has arisen from the difficulty of believing in the restoration of Jewish sacrifices hereafter. But where is the difficulty in believing in their restoration, if it be rightly considered? Those sacrifices will not be sacrifices of atonement, but only of commemoration. They will only serve to commemorate the past sacrifice of the "Lamb of God." Now, it appears to ME to be so far from being incredible that the sacrifice of the Son of God should be commemorated by future sacrifices of certain appointed victims, that it would rather be incredible that so great a sacrifice should be left for ever without anything to commemorate it. I appeal to almost any of your readers if it would not be more reasonable to suppose a future sacrifice offered in Jerusalem, to commemorate the sacrifice on Calvary, than to imagine that nothing whatever should take place in memory of that great event, on the very spot where the sacrifice itself took place, and among the very people whose ancestors had consummated that crime! I believe, therefore, that the restoration of Jewish sacrifices is not only possible, but that their non-restoration would be so strange as to be almost incredible.

Dear Sir, let us never hear again of such a thing as a lapsed prophecy. It is only a more decent phrase for "an unfulfilled promise." For, observe once more, that there are no conditions mentioned in Ezekiel. If once we let loose the waters, who can tell where they will stop. We might just as well suppose that the prophecies of St. John in the Book of Revelation would turn out, by-and-by, to be lapsed prophecies; and then we might bid farewell to the second advent, and put a stop to the "Rainbow:" or St. Paul's prophecy in 1 Thess. iv., might just as well prove a lapsed prophecy. And from lapsed prophecy, remember, there is but one narrow step to lapsed redemption. The Jews will offer sacrifices hereafter to remind them of that sacrifice of atonement which they, unconsciously, offered upon Calvary before.

I remain, dear sir,
Yours sincerely,
Torquay. R. A. PURDON.

P.S. It is remarkable that St. Paul, and the other apostles, all of whom were JEWS, observed many of the customs of the law, after they had become CHRISTIANS. See especially Acts xxi. Is not this one striking evidence that other converted Jews, hereafter, will equally observe the customs of the law? I believe that the apostles acted in that respect as types of the converted Jews in the future millennial dispensation. And so a perpetual distinction will be kept between the Jews on the EARTH and the other nations of the earth; while in the HEAVENLY state there will be neither Jews nor Gentiles.

Digitized by Google

NAPOLEON I. *NOT* "THE MAN OF SIN."*

SIR,—Seeing in your April number a paper stating some arguments for believing Napoleon I. to be "the Man of Sin" spoken of in the book of the Revelation to St. John, I beg to offer some reasons for rejecting this view. I remember "the last days at St. Helena." I knew some of the persons sent there by our government. There were two or three officers and a lady who had a prayer-meeting frequently on his behalf, for some months before the emperor's death. There were boxes of books allowed to be sent to him, among which was a copy of the Old and New Testament, of course in French, with Dr. Bogue's Essay on its Inspiration and Value, with it, which he duly received. Napoleon studied these books diligently, and it was returned after his death to Dr. Bogue's family—marked notes in the margin with the emperor's own hand. Many nights, when he thought no ear was open, save the hearer of prayer, he spent hours in prayer to the God and Father of him who is able to save to the uttermost all who come by him.

It was never known that he unbosomed himself to a fellow-mortal; he refused all church ministrations, he made no sign to man, but the calm beauty of his expressive face seemed to testify that he had peace with God. These things were known in the household. Now let us see; if these are truths, is it possible that he would be called up to perform the *role* of Antichrist in the latter day?

Let us now examine the book of the Revelation. On this point of time John's testimony is, "I was in Spirit (not *the* Spirit), *in* (not on) the Lord's-day." (Rev. i. 10.) It is generally assumed that John saw these visions on the Sunday; but it should be noticed, that in no other instance in the New Testament is the first day of the week called by this name, while in the Old Testament "the day of the Lord" is the time when the Lord shall execute justice and judgment in the earth. The day that the Thessalonian Church *feared* was coming upon them, and which drew from the apostle Paul the assurance that the Church should be removed from the earth before *that day*. (Rev. i. 7.) Now if John's spiritual sight saw the things that were to happen *in* that day, we must *know* that that day, "the day of the Lord," has not yet dawned, because the Church is still on the earth. Antichrist has not yet risen above the horizon, however near we may be to his beginnings, and the Church is here still. It is not necessary to our present purpose to show the exact niche that the thirteenth chapter occupies in the LORD'S-DAY; it is sufficient to show that the seven-headed ten-horned beast, has one of his heads wounded to death, slain by the *sword then* and *there*, "in the day of the Lord;" and that it is after he is so killed by the *sword* (which Napoleon was not), that his death-wound is healed, and that he was, and is not, and yet is, lives, dies, and rises again (after the taking up of the woman clothed with the sun, chap. xii.), set up by the great dragon, the devil, and being a subject of demoniac possession, will by the power of the devil be able to mimic the resurrection of Christ, and play the FRANKENSTEIN of that day

You will notice that this line of argument is quite independent of what has been stated concerning the last days at St. Helena, although each gains strength by the contrast. The successive monarchies of the vision of Daniel are now drawing to a close, at the end of the brazen kingdom, Rome, and as Solomon said by the wisdom of God, "The thing that has been, that shall be again; for there is nothing new under the sun." So under the fourth kingdom the iron or devil element, and the clay or human part, making the kingdom diverse from all others, the full development of evil, shall call forth the resources and power of the Son of Man.

---

* It may be information to some of your readers to be told that the title of Napoleon III. had its origin in the mistake in the printing of the placards, by which he was proclaimed emperor. A note of admiration was placed after Napoleon II.! thus the printer read it III.; and when shown to the emperor, he said let it stand, it is no matter. Already thousands had gone through France, and they were rather hurried in those days.

Digitized by Google

I am unwilling to trespass on your space, but if the two objections laid before you are well founded, I think the verdict will be against Napoleon I. being the future Antichrist. The time is near, even at the doors, when a nation shall be born in a day, and the return of the Jews to Palestine will testify to the time of the Gentiles being fulfilled. Even so come quickly, Lord Jesus.

——— J. U. H.

AN ARGUMENT.

DEAR BROTHER,—I am a constant reader of your magazine, and one who cherishes "the blessed hope." May I, without presumption, call the attention of those who deny the scriptural propriety of the expectation of a veritable Kingdom of Christ on the earth to the apostle Paul's argument in the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians?

I do not remember if the passage I am about to refer to has been commented on by any of your correspondents; but I think it very strikingly proves the scriptural propriety of the views you advocate and which your readers prize so dearly.

The apostle, after affirming the fact that there will be a resurrection, goes on to describe its order. "But every man in his own order. Christ the first-fruits: afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." Now what follows: "*εἶτα τὸ τέλος.*" *Then cometh* the *end.* Then! When? "When he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God."

It appears to me that the apostle clearly makes three distinct stages or epochs, all tending towards and culminating in the grand event—the delivering of the Kingdom. Christ's resurrection is the first act, so to speak, of the glorious drama: "Christ the first-fruits." That is past. We know it has been accomplished. What are we to look for next? The resurrection of the just. "Afterwards them that are Christ's at his coming." This event is yet in the future. We are looking for it. But as we know there has been a long interval between the first act, "Christ the first-fruits," and the second which we are daily looking for, does it not follow that history and experience, as well as the plain meaning of the adverb, "*εἶτα*," warrant us to expect another long interval between the second act—Christ's coming with them that are his—and the end? And how is this interval employed? As I read the passage, it is employed in establishing and completing the Kingdom: "And then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the Kingdom." The kingdom is not spoken of as an existence before Christ's coming. But as it is impossible that it should be delivered up until it has been established and perfected, the necessary inference is that at Christ's coming—the second epoch in the grand chain of events described by Paul—the establishment of the Kingdom will be commenced, and during the interval between his coming, and the end, will be perfected, preparatory to God the Father being all in all.

Am I right in these views? I should be glad if some one more competent than myself would take up this passage, and show more fully its true exegeses.

I am, dear Brother,
Yours very truly,
T. S. F.

NATURAL MORTALITY.

DEAR SIR,—For a considerable time I have been a reader of the *Rainbow*, and have been much pleased and profited by its contents. About twenty-six years I have been engaged in the study of the great theme which distinguishes the *Rainbow*. I am delighted that such a means of information, communication, and discussion exists. There are others in the field, but none that I know of equally acceptable. Never any subject discussed in the "Bow" has given me greater pleasure than that concerning the end of the wicked. I have long been assured, upon the whole evidence of the case, that no theory is or can be further from the truth than that awful one of the unending, unmitigated, torment of the lost. I do not wonder that many whose bowels of compassion and tender mercy, and beholding their fellow-sinners now unsaved, should run upon the other but surely less fearful rock of error, and attempt to prove that as the design of punishment is remedial, God will finally cleanse and redeem all the wicked. This latter theory overlooks the fact that death punishments with us are unalterable and irremedial, and that

Digitized by Google

death, which is the wages of sin, is not remedial with God. Both theories are alike based upon the false and untenable assumption of man's natural immortality. But I will not enlarge in that direction now. I pray God to bless you and your labour, and that he will, by means of the "Bow," convey intelligence and the joy of anticipated deliverance to his people. I am lending it to a few, and am not without hope of winning some as subscribers; besides which it is in my heart otherwise to assist. I have often been disposed to write in reply to articles which I have read in the "Bow," but have refrained lest an unhappy and unprofitable controversy should arise. But I have confidence in your judgment, to both admit freely the discussion of disputed topics, or things in which as yet we see not alike; and also to restrain the abuse of that freedom when it shall attempt to run riot, and trespass upon matters personal. As by our law every one is regarded as innocent until proved to be guilty, so by the law of love every one must be considered honest and sincere until proof to the contrary arises. But all personal matters must yield to the truth; all systems and theories must bear the test of examination and re-examination by the one standard of appeal, the word of God. If any speak or write not according to that word, it is because The Light is not in him. May the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, guide us by that blessed word into the knowledge of the letter, into possession of the Spirit of Christ.

I am, dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
Plymouth. EDMD. MICKLEWOOD.

ONE OF THE SEVEN.

DEAR SIR,—May I ask for a corner in your forthcoming issue, for the purpose of supplying an unintentional omission in my letter, which you were good enough to insert in the number for April?—viz., to refer to ACTS XXI. 8, in confirmation of my remarks on the signification of the ἐκ τῶν ἑπτα of REV. XVII. 11. In the *former* passage, the very same words occur in reference to the case of *Philip*, one of the seven chosen to superintend the temporal affairs of the Church, ἐκ τῶν ἑπτα which we find necessarily rendered "*one of the seven*," though the translators had to supply the word "one," as having no equivalent in the original, so plainly does the sense of the place demand its introduction.

To me it seems evident, that in just the same way, and for the same reason, must the same words in the *latter* be necessarily understood; viz., as identifying the *septimo-octave* (or *quasi* eighth), head of "the beast" with *some one* of the previous "*seven heads*" as "*one of the seven*," having been one of the actual number. The words seem to me incapable of any other signification, and of necessity limited to this, according to the grammatical construction of the sentence; and this, again, is confirmed by the particular marks and characteristics furnished, which plainly point to him who undoubtedly formed the *seventh* head as the individual of the number who shall re-appear as the quasi eighth head, or great personal Antichrist, or "MAN OF SIN."

Though it be quite true, that the present Emperor of the French owes his position, as such, and all he has, and is, solely to his connection with Napoleon I., yet that could, as seems to me, in no way possibly justify the application to *him* of the description here given, ἐκ τῶν ἑπτα. How *could* that make him *one of the seven*; *i.e.*, one of the number? It manifestly could not. Had it been meant to say that the *septimo-octave* head should be merely descended from, or connected by blood with one of the previous seven heads, this would have necessarily been otherwise expressed, as the description furnished in the words, ἐκ τῶν ἑπτα does not convey such an idea.

Yours faithfully,
J. CONYNGHAM MCCAUSLAND.

Clonmere Rectory, Dunleer.

P.S. Through the kindness of a personally unknown friend, in England, I have ascertained that SCHREVELIUS gives "*thicket*" as the meaning of *ναπος*, so that the name NAPOLEON is thus found, as that of the personal "ANTICHRIST," in JER. IV. 7. I may add, that several other reasons than those assigned by me, for applying the

Digitized by Google

predictions of the "MAN OF SIN" to NAPOLEON I., rather than to his nephew, exist, and all of them equally to the point. Since writing my letter on that subject I have received from an Italian gentleman, who had read it (DR. ZIMPELL, of *San Remo*), a publication of his, taking the same view of the resurrection of NAPOLEON I., for the purpose of fulfilling the predictions of the "MAN OF SIN," for which I beg leave to thank him.

THE DOCTRINE OF GENERAL RESTORATION.

To Henry Dunn, Esq.

DEAR SIR,—I am sorry that you charge me with misrepresenting your views as contained in your volume entitled "The Kingdom of God." With all respect I must maintain that I have not done so. I read your work very carefully, and all through my review of it referred my readers to the page where they could judge for themselves whether I represented you accurately or not. Wherever space permitted, I gave your own words. Whether I represented you truly or not, is not however for either you or me to decide, but for those who, interested in the great question to which we have devoted so much of our thought, will take the trouble to compare my review with your work. To their judgment I leave the question.

For the courteous and Christian spirit, however, in which you have replied to the strictures I felt it my duty to make, I now return you my sincere and warm thanks. It only adds to my desire, which I am sorry you forbid me to convert into a hope, that you were wholly, as you are in some most important respects, on our side.

I remain, dear Sir,
Very sincerely yours,
HENRY CONSTABLE.

2 PETER I. 19—24.

DEAR SIR,—In the *Rainbow* for December, 1868, p. 560, Mr. Greenwell gives the above text according to the authorised version, which he characterises thus: "Its clumsiness, rather than its positive incorrectness, has led astray the bulk of the readers." And then he gives "other three versions from distinguished men." With all due respect for Mr. Greenwell's judgment, I think he has quoted three versions very nearly as clumsy as the authorised version itself. If we correct the pointing, we shall have the passage in a better and more intelligent form. This it is quite lawful to do, as the punctuation of our Bibles is merely a human contrivance; and may be wrong, as it is in this, and some other cases. The following is the sense which many good scholars put upon the passages. "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise: in your hearts knowing this first," etc. This is a good alteration, without interfering with the original. I prefer, however, the following, which has been familiar to me for a long time: "We have a more firm word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed (as unto a lamp that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the morning star arise) in your hearts: knowing this first," etc. This reading, I think, will commend itself to Mr. Greenwell.

Yours truly,
GEO. LLOYD, F.S.A.

"THE TEN VIRGINS."

DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly allow me a little space in the *Rainbow* to express a few thoughts on the parable of the "Ten Virgins." The popular interpretations of this parable are, either that the wise virgins are true believers and the foolish only professors, or, that the wise are the waiting, prepared part of the church, and the foolish the unprepared part, who shall be left, after the others are translated, to go through the "great tribulation," but shall be ultimately saved. Now I beg to differ from both of these interpretations. I do not believe that the "kingdom of heaven" refers to the church at all, for this reason: That it is only after the sudden coming of "the Son of Man," and "one has been taken and another left," that the "kingdom of heaven" shall be likened unto ten virgins going forth to meet the Bridegroom, just at that

Digitized by Google

precise period after the church has been taken away, and before the great tribulation. Again, the parable represents a scene entirely Jewish; and whoever heard of an eastern marriage where the bride went forth to meet the bridegroom—only the friends of the bridegroom did so. What then are we to understand by the "kingdom of heaven?" I believe it refers to the *Jewish nation;* that the wise virgins are the *Jewish remnant*—the foolish ones unprepared to receive the Messiah; the one part, sealed before and saved from the tribulation (Rev. vii. 3), the other part brought through and saved with the great multitude, &c. (verse 15). This is again clearly brought out in the promise to the Philadelphian church (Rev. iii. 10). "I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation," &c.; and, in verse 12, "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the *temple* of my God, and he shall go no more out, and I will write upon him the *name of my God*," &c.; which exactly corresponds with the 144,000 standing with the Lamb on Mount Zion, having his *Father's name* written in their foreheads (Rev. xiv. 1), and who, in the fourth verse, are called virgins; they are also said to be the first-fruits (of the Jewish nation, I believe,) to God and to the Lamb. It may be said, If the "kingdom of heaven" means the Jewish nation in this parable, why not in all the parables. To this I answer, If the church is taken away *before* the "kingdom of heaven" can be likened unto ten virgins, &c., it must mean the Jewish nation, and cannot mean the church. Hoping that these few thoughts may bring out the convictions of others on the subject,

I remain yours in Jesus,

J. PATERSON.

Newburgh, Fife.

"THINGS HOPED FOR."

BRIGHTER and better days are on the dawn,
The time, the King long waited for, are near.
Shadows of a heavenly shape and beauty,
Forecast themselves upon the world, and tell
Of substances that follow fast behind.
The years have pregnant grown with destinies,
And now are writhing in the pains of travail:
Events undreamt of struggle to the birth,
Which shall strike dumb with awe, a slumbering world.
All things move on towards a blessed goal,
Men rave—the eternal purpose ripens—
The Christ of God, the Mighty Prince of Life,
Who from the weltering womb of chaos,
Called forth this *Kosmos* as a home for man,
Shall breathe upon the nations, and impart
Life to the dead, strong purpose to the faint;
Infinite love and wisdom shall arrest
The work of ruin; and redeem the world
From sin's dire curse, and man's oppressive rule.
No longer shall the stream of human life,
Flow down through darkness, hissing hot to death,
But upward shape its course to heaven and God,
Adorning earth with righteousness and peace.

J. M. C.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

AUGUST 1, 1869.

TRAINING FOR SERVICE IN "THE AGES TO COME."

"YE have need of patience." How true! Where is the Christian who does not feel this daily? Everything around us, both in the church and the world, is constantly reminding us of our need of patience. In the church, division; in the world, vanity; there is nothing in either upon which you can lay your hand and say, "See this is perfect, this yields entire satisfaction, leaving nothing further to be desired so far as *it* is concerned." Vain is the search for any such model of excellence, either in our ecclesiastical, social, or political arrangements. Men are not satisfied with things as they are; there is a restless craving for change; and as soon as it is obtained the discovery is made that there is deficiency still; the good promised has not been realised; the ideal perfection has not taken the form of actual fact.

Life's trials are manifold; the test is upon us all; and in the case of some its pressure is severe. The consciousness of trust in the Lord, nay, even the Spirit of adoption teaching the heart to say, 'Abba, Father,' does not prevent the painful action of these trials, although it sustains the soul under them. Hence such language as this: "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." And this: "We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed;

Digitized by Google

perplexed, but not in despair; cast down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body."

But the Christian who is familiar with his New Testament, needs no citation from it to remind him that the early disciples of his Lord had fellowship of suffering as well as of joy; and instead of accounting it a strange thing that his faith should be tried, he ought rather to look upon it as one of the elements of that beneficent moral education which prepares him for the glory to be revealed. If there be certainty in one thing it is in this, that the sublime future which inspired men speak of for the called and chosen in Christ Jesus, requires and pre-supposes a preparation—training, education, sanctification, discipline, call it what you will—in the acquisition of which affliction bears a most important part. The grace that freely saves has also arranged that the saved shall be educated—if they are to be of any use in "the ages to come"—but there is this difference, that, whilst the salvation, or the "life," costs them nothing, being God's free gift through Christ, the education costs them much. Self-denial, patience, meekness, a surrender of the human will to that of God, holiness, practical obedience, and the habitual imitation of Christ, in all the imitable features of his character and conduct, are absolutely indispensable. These priceless things are not acquired by a sigh, or a wish, or a prayer; nor will the belief of the truth, however strong and sincere, by itself secure them. Earnest personal effort in the direction of perfect obedience is implied in consecration. "Be ye holy, for I am holy," is the law; and he who would gain the prize awarded to holiness must obey it. Ample is the reward, great is the honour destined to Christian obedience. The morning of glory will surely dawn after the long night of trial.

> "Yea, Truth and Justice then
> Will down return to men,
> Orb'd in a rainbow; and, like glories wearing,
> Mercy will sit between,
> Thron'd in celestial sheen,
> With radiant feet the tissued clouds down steering;
> And Heaven, as at some festival,
> Will open wide the gates of her high palace hall."

The revelations of that morning of joy will more than compensate all the cares and trials and self-discipline of the present; and doubtless we shall be surprised that the clear declarations of Scripture respecting "the glory to be revealed" did not exert a more powerful influence upon our hearts and lives, sustaining us in trouble, and producing more earnest and active labour for the honour of our Lord. "I reckon," writes Paul, "that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the

Digitized by Google

glory which shall be revealed in us." If the felicity of the future is so transcendent as to put comparison between it and the trials of the present out of the question, let us realise the fact as an incentive to patience, and a spur to holy obedience. If we lose sight of the splendid prize, we shall not only become laggards in the race, but we shall also magnify our cares and griefs beyond their actual proportion, and thus run the risk of fostering a spirit of discontent, which is utterly unbecoming and wrong in any follower of Christ. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal." When we feel the burden very heavy, when we are roughly used by the world, when we suffer unchristian treatment at the hands of men professing godliness, let us think of the coming of the Lord, and we shall bear it all. "Now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations, that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honour, and glory, *at the appearing of* JESUS CHRIST." (1 Peter i. 6, 7.) "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you; but rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy" (iv. 12, 13).

Very deficient is that pulpit teaching which makes salvation from sin and its penalty *the end* which God has in view in dealing with believers. Representations of the necessity of faith in Christ are absolutely indispensable as part of the duty of the Christian teacher, but to stop here, as if personal safety embraced the entire outline of divine revelation, is to make a part equal to the whole, and to lose sight of some of the most animating and suggestive disclosures of the holy Book. Why are we saved by grace? Why called and chosen? Why adopted into the divine family? Why justified and sanctified? Why made the objects of special care, and the subjects of special immunities and privileges? Such questions as these are of paramount importance, because the correct answer to them will bring us into moral and mental sympathy with God's unveilings of the future, and lead us gratefully to appreciate the wisdom and love of his dealings with us at present, however painful those dealings may be to our natural feelings. It is perfectly true that "no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous;" it would not be chastening at all were it otherwise; but it is equally true, that "afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness to them who are exercised thereby." To answer these great questions by saying, "It is all of grace," is simply to

Digitized by Google

refer us back to the holy spring, about which there cannot be two opinions among those who are taught of God. It is "all of grace" that there *is* such a river-head of life-giving love; but we want to know whither this pure stream flows; what regions will be fertilised in its course; what forms of life and beauty will bear witness to its virtue; and, as it rolls on through the ages to come, what will be the manifest and manifold effects of its ever-acting power. Or, to drop figure, is the salvation of believers, including in that expression its three prominent ideas, the gift of eternal life, sanctification, and resurrection likeness to Christ, God's *ultimate* purpose with regard to them? Or are these three wonderful endowments, great and marvellous as they are, only divine means to a very glorious end, stately steps in a process which contemplates such high service in the far future as only perfectly Christ-like beings can render? When one thinks of God's infinite wisdom and boundless beneficence; of the majestic slowness with which he develops his eternal plans; of the long ages of preparation before the fulness of time for the birth of the Saviour arrived; of the ages on ages during which the tribes of Israel have been denied possession of the land divinely appointed as their inheritance; of the manifold vicissitudes and multiplied sorrows of the church during the same protracted period; and of the tender care and long-suffering patience with which the Father develops the graces and trains the minds of his children; this question, though at first sight it may seem strange, will be found to contain nothing extravagant, nothing improbable. On the contrary, it is every way in harmony with what we know of God's mode of procedure in the past that his glorified ones in resurrection-life should be selected to show forth his grace and glory in the ages to come, as a city set on a hill which cannot be hid. Historical illustrations of long and painful training for eminent service are not wanting. It is enough to mention the names of Moses, Joseph, David, and Daniel, to prove this statement, and to suggest to the reader a fruitful subject of thought. The past is rich in facts which seem stea lily to point to the future for a still more glorious exemplification of the principle of severe discipline before high and honourable work. Then shall the high mission of the princes of the church, the Saviour's kings and priests, be seen in a light of which at present even the most devout thinkers have a very inadequate conception; and it will be found literally true that they were trained in the wilderness for service of the most glorious kind.

Digitized by Google

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANTICHRIST.

HOW great is the privilege conferred upon the church by the possession of prophecy! Not only the past but the future of man, the future of creation, is here traced out for the children of God to read; they know not only what has been, but what shall be; mortal man is made to comprehend the designs revolving in the Eternal Mind; the creature partakes of the omniscience of the Creator, the finite grasps the Infinite. A key to unlock the mysteries of the future is placed in our hands; and a light, bright as light from heaven alone can be, is flung upon the darkness of the unknown coming time; the brightness of the glory of the unchanging future is cast upon the doubtful, changeful, present of human history. So is prophecy as "a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day star arise in our hearts."

Such is the general aim, such the general character, of Scripture prophecy. But even as the painter shadows his picture that the beauty may be the more evident; even as the musician sounds discord in our ear as the prelude to sweetest harmony; as nature spreads out the dark mantle of night whereby to display the glory of creation's gems; so the Bible tells of days of apostacy and triumphant sin, as ushering in the era of universal righteousness and everlasting peace. In order to render more sweet and melodious the harmony of that prophetic song, "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord," there first strikes upon the ear that note of discord, "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship the beast." The reign of Christ will be preceded by the reign of Antichrist; before the revelation of the Man of Righteousness we see that of the Man of Sin; before the day of the Lord cometh the apostacy; "for that day shall not come except there come the falling away first, and that Man of Sin be revealed, the son of perdition."

The whole field of prophecy is darkened by the shadow of this terrible power; but the fullest descriptions of its rise, character, history, and end, are given by Daniel under the symbol of "the little horn;" by Paul (2 Thess. ii.) under the title of the Man of Sin; and by John, in the Apocalypse, under the designation of the Beast; while the same writer sums up its character in his first epistle in the most expressive word of all, "The Antichrist." A comparison of these passages will manifest their relation to the same events. Daniel, Paul, and John, alike represent the power they describe as a blaspheming, persecuting thing, existing just before the return of the Lord, and destroyed at his coming; we must therefore conclude, either that *three* powers of this character will together appear upon the earth at this time, or that three descriptions refer to the same thing. The language used in 1 John ii. 18, appears to settle the question, since reference is made to *one* power known as "THE Antichrist" (thus in the Greek), implying that the various predictions of great opposers of Christ will centre in *one* especially entitled to this designation.

Who or what is the power thus represented? Is it a person or a system? Are its doings already written upon the page of history, or is its terrible

Digitized by Google

shadow yet to fall upon the world? The majority of Protestant interpreters maintain that the predictions have been realised in the history of the Papacy. A view advocated by so many learned and venerated names is not to be lightly thrown aside, but we are satisfied that a careful comparison of the prophecy with the supposed fulfilment, will show so complete a diserepancy as to necessitate the rejection of the theory. The Antichrist is to arise after the division of the former Roman empire into ten kingdoms (Dan. vii. 24); that division has yet to be made. He is to rise from one of the four kingdoms of the successors of Alexander (Dan. viii. 8, 9), which were absorbed in the Eastern empire. Popery arose in the west. The name of the Antichrist is said to be the name of a man, and to contain the number 666. (Rev. xiii. 18.) Popery is not a man, but a system, and bears no name containing the required number. The Antichrist is to wax very great towards Egypt, Syria, and Palestine (Dan. viii. 9); these are among the countries where Popery has the least power and smallest influence. The Antichrist is to take away the daily sacrifice, and overthrow the temple (Dan. viii. 11); neither sacrifice nor temple has had any existence since the rise of Popery. The Antichrist is to oppress Jerusalem during the greater part of his career (Rev. xi. 2); Popery has no authority in that city. Two "witnesses" are to prophesy in Jerusalem during his reign, endowed with supernatural powers (Rev. xi.); no such witnesses have yet appeared. All the worshippers of Antichrist are to be stamped with his mark, or name, or number (Rev. xiii. 16, 17); no such mark has been worn by the Romanists. Every one not found in the Lamb's book of life will worship Antichrist (Rev. xiii. 8); consequently all who do not thus worship him will by that very fact evince that they are among the blessed number. But can we say that all the idolaters, infidels, and blasphemers who have refused allegiance to Popery are written in the Lamb's book of life? On the other hand, it is plainly stated that all who *do* worship the beast will assuredly be consigned to everlasting torment (Rev xiv. 9, 10); if, therefore, the beast be Popery, every member of the Romish Church is irretrievably lost. Nay, we must be prepared, in all Christian charity and gentleness, to consign to the flames of hell Wickliffe, and Luther, and Calvin, and Melancthon, and every hero of the Reforming age; for all were once adherents of Popery. Further, Antichrist is to retain power for 1260 days (Rev. xiii. 5; Dan. vii. 25), and no hint is given that these are not literal periods of time; Popery has continued for centuries. Antichrist is to be overthrown by the coming of the Lord (2 Thess. ii. 8); Popery by the ten kings of the Roman world. (Rev. xvii. 16, 17,) The statement of this last prophecy is, indeed, decisive of the question; for we read, "The ten horns shall hate the whore, and burn her with fire: FOR God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled." Thus we learn that the woman will be destroyed to make room for the beast; Popery will be overturned in order that the kingdom of Antichrist may be established; how then can the two be identical? In the future, not in the past; as a person, not as a system only, will Antichrist appear.

It is of great importance that the church should understand the character and career of this future Antichrist. Even in the apostles' days this subject occupied a prominent position in the instruction given to the

Digitized by Google

church; for we find Paul writing to the Thessalonians at length respecting the Man of Sin, and saying, "Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" The reason of this will be readily perceived. The reign of the Antichrist will be the culminating period of man's rebellion against God, the dark hour of night immediately preceding the dawn of the everlasting morning; and as such, as a sign of the speedy manifestation of the Son of God, is of great interest to the believer; it is a cloud of blackest darkness, but it is fringed with the brightness of the glory of "the blessed hope." And yet more, the blasphemous times of Antichrist will be but the issue of principles at work now, and which have ever been at work in the church and the world. Popery itself is the great precursor of Antichristianism, so much so that many have mistaken the blossom for the fruit. In the closing years of his life, John wrote of the spirit of Antichrist, "Even now already is it in the world;" while Paul some forty years before declared, "the mystery of iniquity doth already work." Thus these dark times of the future cast their shadow over all preceding years, and possess an interest and importance by no means to be measured by their brief duration, demanding our close and attentive consideration. Let us therefore point out those features of the rise and early history of this power, by which the church will be able to identify it upon its appearance.

I. The Antichrist will arise after the division of the whole Roman empire into ten kingdoms (Dan. vii. 24), presenting the following characteristics:—1st. They will be equally divided between the former Eastern and Western empires, even as *each* leg of the symbolical image (Dan. ii.) terminates in five toes. 2nd. They will embrace the whole of what was once Roman territory, so that the kingdoms of Roman origin will not exceed ten in number, otherwise the beast must needs have had more than ten horns, the image more than ten toes. 3rd. They will be as unmistakable as the empires of the past, for the toes were as readily perceived as the head of gold itself. 4th. They will exercise supreme power in the world, for they form a portion of the image of universal empires. 5th. They will all possess the mixed system of government, denoted by the mingling of clay and iron. 6th. They will continue in existence until destroyed by the kingdom of Christ, symbolised by the stone cut out from the mountain. No such kingdoms have ever yet had an existence. Those which arose on the downfall of the Western empire, and which are so strangely, sometimes, supposed to be contemplated in these predictions, differed *in every particular* from the requirements of the prophecy. They were exclusively confined to the West; they far exceeded ten in number, expositors are utterly at variance as to their identity, they were exceedingly weak, transient, and uninfluential; they existed long before the now prevailing ideas of popular rights had been so much as whispered, they were overthrown *not* by the kingdom of Christ, but by the assaults of earthly foes. Thus the kingdom of the Britons was uprooted by the savage heathens who came over with Hengist and Horsa; and if these were missionaries of the cross, they certainly assumed a remarkably rough disguise. Never yet has this tenfold division been made. It is vain therefore to seek the Antichrist in Popery, or any system of the past; vain to look for him in any potentate of the present; the reign of the ten kings has yet to commence, and he is to "arise *after* them."

Digitized by Google

II. The Antichrist is to be of Grecian origin. To prove this, we must first ask attention to the prophecy, Daniel viii. Some interpreters maintain that "the little horn" here predicted is the notorious Antiochus Epiphanes, and not the Antichrist, which latter view Barnes conclusively refutes thus:—"A few expositors have supposed that this passage refers to Antichrist; what will not expositors of the Bible suppose?" Certainly, we must submit they suppose many strange and curious things, as a perusal of Barnes's *Notes* will abundantly testify, this reference of "the little horn" to Antiochus being a case in point. For the little horn of the vision is represented as waxing great *towards* the East (Syria), implying that it would be outside that kingdom;—Antiochus was himself the king of Syria. Besides, we have the express declaration of the angel (verse 17) that the vision will extend to "the time of the end," and to "the last end of the indignation" against the Jews (verse 19). Were the days of Antiochus the time of the end; was God's indignation against his ancient people exhausted then? Let the dreadful tragedy of the Roman siege, and the present condition of Israel, give the reply. Nor is the interpretation of Bishop Newton, that the little horn is the Roman dominion, admissible, for "the little horn" is said (verse 9) to arise from the fragments of the Macedonian empire, whereas Rome existed long before their formation. Even the bishop is compelled to seek the fulfilment of the final clauses of the prophecy in Rome Antichristian; there we find the whole. The same symbol of a little horn is used in chap. 7, and is there admitted to refer exclusively to Antichrist; the identical symbol used in the following vision suggests identity of reference. The description of both fully accord; both appear just before the advent, the time of the end; both overturn three kingdoms; both display surpassing wisdom, and daring impiety; both make war against the people of God; both are overthrown by superhuman power. These coincidences themselves prove a reference to the same person, and the conclusion is rendered certain by the fact that no reference to the past is possible, as we have shown. The vision of the seventh chapter introduces this power; that of the eighth enlarges our information respecting it; the former describes his relation to the Gentile world, the latter to the Jews; a distinction marked also by the one being written in Chaldee, the other in the Hebrew tongue.

This point being established, it follows that the Antichrist will rise from *one of the four ancient divisions of Alexander's empire*, Greece, Thrace, Syria, and Egypt, as predicted in verse 9. Not from the two latter, for he is represented outside these, and waxing great "towards" them; the locality, therefore, is restricted to Greece and Thrace.

Turning now to Rev. xiii. 2, we find him depicted under the symbol of the beast, in which the characteristics of the four great empires are united. He is a nondescript beast, like that which represented Rome (Dan. vii. 7), indicating that his dominion will be the Roman empire revived; he has the mouth of the lion, the arrogance of Babylon (Dan. vii. 4); the feet of a bear, the cruelty of Persia (Dan. vii. 5); but of the beast as a whole it is said it was "like a leopard," the symbol of GREECE. (Dan. vii. 6.) Even more striking is the language of Zech. ix. 13, where the overthrow of the Antichristian army by the Jews at the Lord's coming is described as a raising up of the sons of Zion against the sons of GREECE.

We thus gather that the Antichrist will arise from Greece, either being

Digitized by Google

of Grecian descent, or connected with the kingdom in "the latter time" of its existence. But how is it with Popery? It has never even obtained power in this land, whose inhabitants, preferring an idolatry of their own devising to that provided by the bishops of Rome, yield obedience to the rival claims of the Eastern Church.

In this connection it may be well to refer to the statement of the angel, (Rev. xvii. 8), "the beast that thou sawest was, and is not," words utterly inapplicable to the Papal power. For the verse is not a portion of the vision seen by John, but of *the angel's explanation*, and therefore describes the state of things existing *when the words were uttered.* When the angel says (verse 10), "five are fallen, and one is," it is readily perceived by those who suppose the beast to be the Papal power, that he describes what was the position of affairs then; we must insist upon a like interpretation of verse 8. *At the time the angel spoke,* the beast had been, and was not. This was not the case with the Roman power, and to that, therefore, the angel cannot have referred; but understood of the Antichrist in the light of his origin, his words have a very manifest application. The dominion of Antichrist will be a revival of Grecian influence, the re-establishment of Grecian power, the resurrection, not necessarily of a person, but of a kingdom. At the time the angel spoke, the independence of Greece had departed, her power had been blotted out, her dominion was a thing of the past, and it could truly be said "It was, and is not." It has been reserved for our day to witness its re-appearance prefatory to that time when one of its sons will exercise lordship over the world. Rome long ruled over Greece, Greece in its turn will rule Rome, "and they that dwell upon the earth shall wonder, when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is;" "is not," for the dominion of Antichrist will not be the re-establishment of the Grecian empire; "and yet is," for it will be the revival of Grecian influence and power.

III. The name borne by this future King will do much to establish his identity. In Rev. xiii. 18, we read, "Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred three score and six." From the preceding verse, we gather that the number is "the number of his name;" that is, the various letters comprising his name, taken at their numerical value in the Greek, which largely represented numbers by letters, will amount to 666. Applied to the Papal power, its solution is sought in Lateinos, "the Latin man." But the true spelling of this word is Latinos, the letters of which do not give the required total, and moreover Popery is not "the Latin man," but the Latin church. The statement that the number is that of a *man,* precludes the application to Popery, or to any *system,* and asserts the personality of the Antichrist. And it is noticeable that six is very near seven, the perfect number, and yet falls short of it; a name therefore containing the number 666 will be aptly worn by him who will be the perfection of imperfection.

IV. This king will be peculiarly cunning and crafty in character. When he appears in vision upon the Roman beast (Dan. vii.) it is as a horn, "having eyes like the eyes of a man," denoting the highest degree of wisdom. By the angel (Dan. 8), he is described as "understanding dark sentences;" the same word which is used of the queen of Sheba, when it is said she came to prove Solomon with "hard questions." Still

Digitized by Google

further it is said that "through his policy he shall cause craft to prosper in his land, and by peace shall destroy many" (Dan. viii. 25); or as it is described in the fifty-fifth Psalm, "the words of his mouth were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart;" perhaps, like a well-known potentate, murmuring "L'Empire, c'est la paix," and forthwith filling Europe with the sound of war. Hence, in this respect too, the emblem of the leopard is peculiarly appropriate, as representative of mingled cunning and cruelty, such as that which characterised ancient Greece.

V. The rise of this prince willbe gradual. The symbol used by Daniel to denote his rise—that of "a little horn"—indicates that at first he will have but feeble power. It has been seen that he will arise from Greece, yet he will not be the king of Greece, nor of any of the ten kingdoms; for the ten horns exist before his rise, and continue after his appearance. Yet ere long this little horn will have swollen to such gigantic dimensions as to answer the description of Daniel, to whom he appeared as "waxing great, even to the host of heaven, and casting down some of the host and of the stars to the ground." (Dan. viii. 10.) The ten kings of the Roman world will place themselves under his supremacy, "for God shall put it into their hearts to agree, and to give their kingdom to the beast;" and so "the little horn" of Daniel will become "the beast" of the Apocalypse, representing in his person the re-constituted and re-united power of Rome.

VI. A special and intimate alliance will be formed between this king and the Jewish remnant at that time in possession of their native land, and forming one of the ten kingdoms of the Roman world. The proof of this is contained in the prophecy recorded in Daniel ix. We there read (verse 27) "he shall confirm a covenant with many for one seven" (the original does *not* imply a seven of *days*, but rather *years*). That the "many" here referred to is the Jewish people in Palestine, is manifest, for Daniel is expressly told that the prophecy relates to "thy people and thy holy city" (verse 24). They form one party to this covenant; but who is the "he" who shall confirm it? Some argue the Messiah; to which it is sufficient to reply, that the interpretation is contrary to fact, no such seven years' covenant was ever entered into by him. The immediate antecedent of the pronoun is, "the prince that shall come," and it is but reasonable to suppose he is the person intended. Then ensues the enquiry, who is "the prince that shall come?" Not any prince of by-gone days, for no such covenant has ever yet been entered into; it is a thing of the future. The form of expression used implies that the angel refers to a power, the character and history of which had been previously made known, and which would, therefore, be well understood when thus incidentally alluded to. Only one such power is found in this book, and that is the Antichrist, described under the symbol of "the little horn" by the same angel in the previous chapter. In confirmation of this interpretation we find that the things expressly predicted of "the little horn"—the taking away the daily sacrifice and pollution of the temple—are here also expressly mentioned as deeds of "the prince that shall come." Is it possible to avoid the conclusion that the two are identical; that it is the Antichrist fully described in the previous vision who is thus alluded to as to a well known "prince that shall come"? that consequently it is he who will confirm this seven years' covenant with the restored Jews of Jerusalem and the Holy Land.

Digitized by Google

The object of this covenant is sufficiently apparent. With a kingdom newly constituted, and even newly peopled, the rulers of Palestine will not be slow to perceive the advantage of alliance with so formidable a prince; nor will he fail to discern the wisdom of securing the goodwill and support of so brave, energetic, and prosperous a people, especially when in their own land, so favourably circumstanced for the pursuits of commerce, and occupying so important a military position. The manner of expression of the prophecy seems to imply that the enforced cessation of the daily sacrifice will be a breach of the covenant, confirming an impression we should naturally entertain that the covenant will be especially intended to secure to the Jews their national worship and sacrifices. The question has sometimes been asked, will the sacred fire first kindled from heaven be made again to burn upon the altar, and by what means will it be accomplished? The alliance with Antichrist may perhaps furnish the answer; for he is stated (Rev. xiii. 13,) to be able to make fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and thus he will succeed in restoring the grandeur of Judaism. With many such empty expressions of respect for this "ancient faith," as all kingcraft is never slow to use, he will proclaim its re-establishment upon its native soil; the temple will again crown the summit of Moriah; the pomp and splendour of the Mosaic ritual will again delight the Jewish heart; the flame once more will burn upon the altar; the smoke of sacrifice again ascend to heaven; Jerusalem again be crowded with worshippers. The work of God will be counterfeited by Satan, and Israel's stolid unbelief will issue in credulous acceptance of the Man of Sin. Very significant, in view of their coming reception of the false one, was that solemn warning of the true, "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not; another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." (John v. 43.) They rejected the self-sacrificing Messiah; they will receive the self-seeking Antichrist. Hence their worship and sacrifice well be unpleasing and even detestable to the God to whom it will be presented; the one great sacrifice has been offered, what need of their shadowy figures? the one means of their acceptable spiritual worship has been made known, why then this costly temple and gorgeous ritual? Temple and sacrifice will alike bear witness only to Israel's sin and unbelief. In view of this time therefore, the prophet Isaiah after describing the glories of Messiah's reign, dwells upon this epoch immediately preceding it, saying (ch. lxvi. 1—4), "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool; where is the house that ye build unto me, and where is the place of my rest? He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol. Yea, they have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations. I also will choose their delusions, and will bring their fears upon them; because, when I called, none did answer: when I spake, they did not hear: but they did evil before mine eyes, and chose that in which I delighted not." For the oft-repeated story of Israel's past will be reproduced in the future; their chosen friend and ally will prove to be their destined oppressor; the arm on which they leaned will hurl against them the thunderbolt of destruction. His alliance with the Jews, and patronage of their worship, will be but one step in that ladder whereby

Digitized by Google

the Man of Sin will climb to the full altitude of his predicted blasphemy, when he himself "as God, will sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." (2 Thess. ii. 4.) The ratification of the covenant will doubtless be received with shouts of delight by a heedless and ungodly world, as full of promise of increasing commercial prosperity; but to the eye of the Christian student it will be the warning of coming doom, one of the most significant of the many signs which will then trouble the earth and cover the face of heaven, indicating that the dark night of long threatened tribulation is about to enshroud the world, only, blessed be God, to usher in the exceeding brightness, and unending glory of the millennial morning.

Patricroft, Manchester. WILLIAM W. SKEMP.

HELL:

REGARDED AS A PLACE WHERE IT IS "GOOD" BUT NOT "HONOURABLE" TO BE.*

WE had not time in our last article, in the *Rainbow* for June, to conclude our review of Mr. Birks' extraordinary theory. We now proceed to do so. We saw that his mode of producing content in hell was the perception by souls, suffering the punishment of intense and unending anguish, of God's "awful and stupendous consolation" to themselves, and of the glory and the happiness of the redeemed and the angelic world. We also saw that our experience in this life affords us no analogy to such a state of things as Mr. Birks describes as the eternal future of hell. We cannot *now* understand how compassion is shown to persons on whom is inflicted the full punishment due to their evil deeds. Nor is it in accordance with *our present feelings* that contentment is produced by the beholding of others in the enjoyment of that which we should wish for, but from which we are for ever debarred.

We think, therefore, that we are justified in asking Mr. Birks for some *proof* of this theory. Asked to believe in what is contrary to all experience, and opposed to our ordinary ideas of compassion and of punishment, we look to Mr. Birks for a reason of the faith that is in him, and which he wishes to produce in us. We are at first inclined to ask if Mr. Birks sets up any claim to a new revelation, such as Mohammed made 1200 years ago, and the Spiritualists and others are making now. We do not find, however, that he makes any claim of this kind, so that we are not called on to examine its title. Nor do we find that Mr. Birks appeals to any tradition of the church, lurking in some despised Nazareth, and waiting the time when it is to be called forth from its obscurity and made an article of faith essential to salvation. The secretary of the Evangelical Alliance is

* "The Victory of Divine Goodness." By T. R. Birks, M.A., Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Cambridge. Rivingtons, 1867.

Digitized by Google

too good a Protestant for that, though we are not *quite* sure that he does not verge upon something very like it. (x., xi., p. 174.) To us Henry Newman and T. R. Birks appear to be digging in the same field, but it may be that one will dig up error and the other truth. So after all Mr. Birks has nothing to appeal to except the good old Bible.

Well, that is enough. We have seen appeals to tradition long enough, and we know that they have ended, and must end, in apostacy. We have seen appeals to God's word, and, with all our differences on lesser matters, we believe that such appeals result in substantial unity. The Apostles' Creed is the grand old standard of the apostolic age, and the churches which appeal to Scripture as their sole rule of faith agree in accepting that fine old creed, and even allowing that it contains all dogma essential to salvation. Let us hear Mr. Birks' appeal to the word of God for the theory that it will be "good," though it will not be "honourable" to spend an endless life in hell.

Alas! when it comes to this proof we find that Mr. Birks has none to give us. While we are waiting to hear some passages of Scripture, which in our carelessness we had hitherto overlooked, and wondering from which of the prophets or apostles they are to be produced, Mr. Birks candidly informs us he has not a text to bring forward! Not a text! Positively not one! No; not one text from Genesis to Revelation. This seems very curious. When Mohammed set up for a prophet, he was at least able to quote the text, "*He shall give you another Comforter,*" and apply it to himself. When Rome claims infallibility for her long line of Popes, she is able to quote, "*Thou art Peter.*" When the ordinary Augustinians or Athenagorians are driven from the old class of texts which they used to flourish in our faces, they have at any rate two fine poetico-figurative ones in Revelation about "the smoke of torment ascending up for ever," which they defy us to analyse. And Mr. Birks is to tell us that he is unable to do what all these have done! It is curious, but it is the case. We could scarcely believe it if he had not told us so himself. But here we are unable to refuse him perfect credence, for in truth he only tells us what we had fully believed before we ever saw his book.

"On the solemn topic," of which he has been treating, he tells us "it is dangerous to speak, *when Scripture,* on the surface at least, *appears to keep silence.*" In another place he adds, "*The Scriptures have passed by this secret purpose of God in total silence*" (p. 45). Here is Mr. Birks' candid confession that he has not so much as a single text to produce for his theory from one end of the Bible to the other.

We remember in our schooldays, now among old memories, Horace arguing the case of his Satiric muse with his old friend the lawyer Trebatius. He ends it all, as was very usual with the genial Roman, *with a laugh. Solventur risu tabulæ.*

We are ourselves tempted to end our review as Horace ends his satire, and here bid good-bye to Mr. Birks. Surely if a theory so novel, so paradoxical, so opposed to all experience, cannot have produced for it one text of Scripture, and is put forward by a man who makes no claim to prophetical powers, it may safely be dismissed to the limbo of neglected and exploded theories. It has produced *a sensation;* and having done so has no more that it can do.

But Mr. Birks will not let us go so easily. He is, on this question of

Digitized by Google

future punishment, pre-eminently the man of paradox. He has already exhibited his unrivalled powers in this respect by painting the sinner's future from the opposite standpoints of Origen and Augustine. He now proceeds to show us that his powers are by no means exhausted, but are fully capable of another similar feat. Having told us that the Scriptures are *totally silent* upon this theory of his, he in the same breath declares that it is one of their "revealed truths" (p. 173); and having informed us that it was part of the "*secret purpose of God,*" he then informs us that he knows all about it, and will let all the world into the secret. Meditations which we, too hastily taking Mr. Birks at his first word, supposed to be the coinage of his cunning brain, are, in his second word, "*deeply rooted in Scripture*" (p. 7). "*Contradiction*"—cries the simple reader! No; "Paradox"—cries Mr. Birks. "*I cannot understand it*" adds the simple reader." *You scarcely could,*" replies Mr. Birks, "*it is a mystery.*"

But how does Mr. Birks remove it from the category of contradiction to that of paradoxes? Our readers have already seen how Mr. Birks has effected this process in the case of those whom in hell he describes as being at once lost and saved. We do not know whether they have understood the process. We frankly allow that if they have, they are a vast deal cleverer than the man who is now addressing them. If they understood the former process they will, we have no doubt, understand the latter. Otherwise we fear they will rise from our paper, as we rose from Mr. Birks' book, unenlightened.

Scripture, then, according to Mr. Birks, reveals its truths in two ways. The first is *by what it says;* the second is *by what it does not say.* The first is *by its speech;* the second is *by its silence.* In this way—a simple and ready one surely—the whole thing is made plain. There are, we will suppose, a great many passages which teach some particular doctrine, with clearness and distinctness. There is no doubt as to their sense and meaning. We are, according to Mr. Birks, to accept their meaning as undoubtedly true. But we are not altogether pleased with the result which we arrive at from these passages alone. Their teaching is too harsh; we want it modified. Mr. Birks allows this feeling to be a very proper one, and proceeds to gratify it. He points out to us the fact that if there are those texts in question teaching a particular thing, there are *also a great many other texts that say nothing whatsoever about it.* If we do not at once perceive the force of this subtle reasoning, he proceeds to tell us. *Under these texts, which say nothing, there is hidden the very truth, or modification of truth, which you desire. You are wholly unable to see it, but you may depend upon its being there.*

Such is the only meaning which, with every wish to treat Mr. Birks fairly, we can put upon his language. The mysteries of God, of which Mr. Birks tells us he is the steward to dispense, are "*found only beneath the surface*" *of the Scriptures* (vii.). The "deep analogies" on which he relies, "*lie below the surface*" (p. 48). "Its revealed truths" are truths "*below the surface*" (p. 173). Putting these repeated expressions of his in juxtaposition with his other expression, that "*the Scriptures have passed by this secret purpose of God in total silence*" (p. 45), we know not what other interpretation we can put upon Mr. Birks meaning than that which we have put. If it is not a satisfactory one, we cannot help it.

But we fairly acknowledge that we will not, and cannot follow Mr.

Digitized by Google

Birks in his appeal from the plain and positive declarations of Scripture in one place to its silence in another. We do not pretend to be able to see what is under the "surface of Scripture," any more than we are able to see what is under the surface of the earth. Our spiritual vision is not stronger than our physical. In these mining operations, underground, we are unable to partake. Mr. Birks must work by himself. But we unhesitatingly assert that the strange thing which he has brought to light does not impress us with the smallest idea that he is a bit better able to see below the surface than we are ourselves. Nor do we think that the Christian public will be at all better satisfied, either with Mr. Birks' production or his attestation of it, than we are. We doubt if his "Victory of Divine Goodness" has made a single proselyte; or whether there is any man of ordinary intelligence, from one end of England to the other, who can say, after a careful perusal of the book, that he understands what he is at. Augustine's theory is comprehensible; so is Origen's; so is Mr. Dunn's, which we reviewed in the *Rainbow* for May; but this mixture of Origen and Augustine as presented by Mr. Birks is truly incomprehensible. While, as he does not yet pretend to be a divine prophet, we do not feel at all bound to accept, on his mere word, his incomprehensible scheme.

But even supposing that Mr. Birks' theory were "revealed below the surface of Scripture," and that the extraordinary arrangement, now for the first time, we believe, presented to the church by any sane man, were indeed drawn forth out of God's hidden treasures, we cannot understand how Mr. Birks can feel justified in thus drawing it forth. He tells us it is one of God's *secrets*: he tells us that God has kept it secret for a very wise purpose, namely, that "the solemn contract of reward and punishment" might "work its full effect, *unmingled and unmitigated*, upon the hearts of men." (p. 46.) Why, we ask, if God had this wise object in view, does Mr. Birks do his best to defeat it by letting the secret out? Why, if God meant by the display of terrors he never meant to execute to frighten men into goodness, does Mr. Birks tell the world that these terrors do not really exist, at least to any such extent as God had spoken of? Is Mr. Birks wiser than God? Is he able to correct God's mistakes? Of one thing, however, we are certain, that if God had intended to keep this thing secret, Mr. Birks would never have found it out.

But we must enter our solemn protest against what seems to us a blasphemous mode of speaking of God and of his dealings. To suppose that God says more than he means; that he holds out threats that he never means to execute; that he uses language which uninspired men are to take, and alter, and modify, in order to be able to justify their Maker in the eyes of his creatures, appears to us nothing short of blasphemy. Mr. Birks has not, however, the poor merit of originality. The same thing has been, in substance, said over and over again. Mr. Birks may have seen it in Tillotson's famous sermon, "Of the Eternity of Hell Torments." The great court preacher first tells us that eternal torments are, indeed, what God has threatened in his word; he then proceeds to tell us that he is wholly unable to see that this punishment is just, but that, perhaps, it may be justified, on the principle that, injustice shown to one portion of God's creatures, may be demanded by *a state necessity*, namely, the well-being of the rest. Evidently ill at ease with a view which would be scouted out of an earthly court of justice, he falls at length into the pleasing idea that

Digitized by Google

God may not, after all, execute what he threatens; a procedure which the silver-tongued prelate describes as God's being "*better than his word.*" Mr. Birks has, in his own way, but repeated the ingenious evasion of Tillotson. He tells us that God has indeed threatened eternal misery, and said not one word to the contrary; he describes this eternal misery in the most fearful terms: but when his own mind recoils from the picture, and when he sees in others unmistakable evidence that it disquiets them, he, out of his own conjectures, qualifies his picture, throws in strong touches of light, overlays the terrible, and then gravely tells us that the prospect will be a very different one from what we might have supposed if we only had God's words to go upon. Far be it from us thus to treat the words of our God. But what must be that terrible theory which is ever thus forcing men of intelligence, of knowledge, of piety, into miserable subterfuges, which on other doctrines they would denounce with all the fire of righteous indignation!

To one other feature in Mr. Birks' work we would wish to draw attention, as showing how his theory of the second death, as a fruit of redemption, lands him in inextricable contradiction with Scripture.

The course of his work leads him, as it needs must, to the solemn question of the *resurrection of the wicked.* Let us attend well and closely to this point, for it is one which, though it has been but little discussed, must enter largely into the consideration of this entire matter. The Augustinians have generally been very chary as to their references to this point. So they well may. It is a rock ahead of their vessel, whatever way they steer. But Mr. Birks' modification of the Augustinian heresy enables him, and obliges him, to discuss it freely and without reserve. As hell is with him a work of redemption, so he views every event which is connected with the second death. Of these, the resurrection of the bodies of the wicked is one of the chief. It would appear that man is only viewed in Scripture in connection *with the body.* Made originally of dust, it is with this dust that all his good and evil, his joy and sorrow, are bound up. In this life, man is perfect man, because he is in the body; at the resurrection, he will be perfect man for the same reason. Hades is an imperfect state, because there the soul is unclothed.

Mr. Birks accordingly treats the question of the resurrection of the wicked in a plain and intelligible way. It is with him, just as much as the resurrection of the just, a fruit of Christ's redemption. It is with him also, a work just as complete and perfect in the case of the wicked as of the righteous. We cannot see, from his account, that the risen bodies of the ungodly are in any way inferior to the risen bodies of the just. If we here go a little too far, we hold ourselves open to correction. Our error is certainly one of no considerable extent. "The life-restoring resurrection, he tells us, is to come, *in every case,* through the power and work of the Second Adam, the Lord from heaven;" and then, speaking specially of the resurrection of the wicked, he adds, "*their bodies are first restored completely from the ruin of the grave, and the dominion of death, so far, is wholly abolished.*" (p. 88.) In another place, he tells us that the "*resurrection, in every case, is an effect of the redeeming work of Christ;*" "*it is by virtue of his death for all,* that all who are in the graves shall hear his voice, and come forth to stand before him in judgment." (p. 168.)

Here we join issue with Mr. Birks. In this whole description, we

Digitized by Google

maintain, he is at utter variance with God's word. He is confounding two totally different things. He is attributing to the unjust what is only true of the just. He is thrusting the lost into the place of the saved. In "*the resurrection of the body*," of the apostle's creed, the unjust have no more part than they have in its "life everlasting." We are not saying that they will not rise. We know they will. We know that they will rise at the voice of Christ, but this voice will be to them in resurrection just as much the voice of judgment as when it is heard somewhat later on telling them, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

We first remark of Mr. Birks' view that, in it, he makes the resurrection of the wicked to be fully and completely a resurrection of their body *to eternal life*. He describes it as "*a life-restoring resurrection*"—a resurrection in which "*their bodies are restored completely from the ruin of the grave*," and *the dominion of death, so far, is wholly abolished*." (p. 188.) There can be no doubt that here Mr. Birks describes the resurrection of the wicked to be a resurrection *to life*, and to be *identical with the resurrection of Christ*, who, "being raised from the dead, dieth no more: death hath no more dominion over him." (Rom. vi. 9.) Mr. Birks' theory has the misfortune to be contradicted by Scripture in *both* these respects. "The *resurrection of life*" *is especially confined by our Lord to them that have done good*" in this present dispensation; he calls that of the wicked "the resurrection of damnation." (John v. 29.) Again, the apostle Paul expressly confines all resurrection resembling that of Christ to those who have in this life died with him to sin. "*If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.*" (Rom. vi. 5.) He then goes on to tell us that this resurrection of Christ is that of one who, "*being raised from the dead, dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him.*" (v. 9.) So far from the unjust having such a resurrection, it is here denied to them by St. Paul. We suppose Mr. Birks has some "deep analogy," and some revelation "below the surface of Scripture," to oppose to this revelation on its surface, but we cannot accept his fancies as any set-off against the plain word of God.

We were for the moment, however, forgetting that Mr. Birks here does claim to have a text in Scripture in favour of his theory. So extraordinary a feature in his argument deserves particular attention and it shall have it. We apprehend that it will appear that it would have been better for him to rely solely on his "revelations below the surface." In these latter we are no match for him, as he has this whole underground region to himself. In the former we fight him on a fair open field. In p. 168, Mr. Birks undertakes to prove that the resurrection of the wicked is one of the effects of Christ's redemption. His words are: "it is a revealed truth and promise of God's word, that there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust. *And this resurrection, in every case, is an effect of the redeeming work of Christ.* "*For, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.*" He here, it will be seen, quotes 1 *Cor.* xv. 22, *as relating to the unjust as much as to the just.* It is most instructive how the holders of Augustine's and Origen's heresies on the future of the wicked linger round and cast longing eyes on this grand chapter of God's word. There are so many expressions in it—"incorruption," "immortality," &c.—which are just the expressions which they want, which they find very

Digitized by Google

plentifully in Tertullian, and Origen, and Athenagoras, and Plato, but which they have searched the Scriptures backward and forward without being able to find applied there to any but God, and those who derive them from God through obedience and faith. This fine chapter abounds with these expressions. It is conned over from end to end with anxious eye. "Could we," say they, "get these expressions only to attach to the unjust, we could keep them alive in hell for ever." To do them justice, they do not often claim it for this purpose. They look at it as the fox in the fable looked at the grapes that hung out of his reach: "It is a tempting chapter," they say in their hearts, "but we fear it cannot be made to speak as we would have it;" and so, with a deep sigh, they turn back to that stronghold of the Augustinian divines, who are in blissful ignorance of the Hebrew tongue. (Genesis ii. 7.) But sometimes they are not thus cautious. Sometimes a soldier of Augustine and Origen, more daring than his fellows, carried off beyond all forbearance by the tempting sight of these priceless phrases, dashes out of the ranks and claims one or more of them as a trophy of his prowess. Augustine himself set them the example. He had been talking Platonically so often about the immortality and incorruptibility of the wicked in hell that *he must have one text in the Bible* for it. He felt that that would be better for his purpose than Plato's fine-spun reasoning from the "harmonies," or even his own demonstrations from the mathematical figures in Euclid and out of Euclid.* Was not "*the dead shall be raised incorruptible*" (verse 52), just the very thing the bishop wanted? No doubt it was. It was short, clear, decisive, unmistakable. Accordingly Augustine claimed this one little bit of the chapter for his horrible pet theory of the future of the wicked, while he candidly and magnanimously abandoned the rest of the chapter as not suitable for his purpose.† Mr. Birks is full as daring as Augustine. Indeed, we are inclined to think that he is a great deal more so, and would claim much more of this chapter for his purpose than the African bishop ever dreamed of doing. At all events he claims some of it—the twenty-second verse—as equally applicable to the unjust and just.

Now there never was a more deplorable mistake made by any man pretending to the name of a Christian divine than to apply this fifteenth chapter of the 1 Cor., or any part of it, to the resurrection of the unjust. The resurrection of the redeemed believer is constantly spoken of in the New Testament as "*the resurrection*," because it is the only resurrection that is permanent and lasting in its effects (Matt. xxii. 30; Luke xx. 35—36). It is of this resurrection only that Paul speaks in 1 Cor. xv. He is only speaking of the result of Christ's redemption to his true people (verses 18, 19). We cannot stop at any pet phrase or verse we please, select this for our purpose, and abandon the rest. The entire description is the description of one and the same event, of one and the same class of persons. If Mr. Birks will needs apply verse 22, to the unjust, he must perforce apply verses 42, 43, and 44 also. But this is too much even for Mr. Birks. His orthodoxy cannot be stretched quite so far. He would gladly accept, no doubt, verses 51—54, but there is one unhappy phrase in 43rd verse which he cannot do away with. Here the body is said by Paul

* Augustine Opera, Antwerpia, 1700. De Quantitate Animæ.
† 11. 587. 15—11. 585. 8.

Digitized by Google

to be "*raised in glory,*" whereas Mr. Birks has told us more than once that the body of the unjust will be "raised to shame and contempt" (171.) But for that one little awkward phrase positively Mr. Birks could claim the entire chapter!

It is a pity to throw away so much ointment for one dead fly, and we would beg leave to make a suggestion to Mr. Birks. He has, we suppose, followed Daniel xii. 2, when he described the resurrection of the unjust as a resurrection to shame and contempt. Have not some hard things been said of this whole book of Daniel, and particularly of its latter chapters? We have heard of Porphyry among the ancients, and Spinoza, Hitzig, Lücke, and others among modern critics. Would Mr. Birks endorse their sentiments! No, he is not prepared yet to go quite so far! Well, he has another mode of escape to which he is more accustomed to resort. Why not appeal to one of his "deep analogies" and "revealed truths below the surface"? It is only to suppose that some of these modify and qualify Daniel's harsh expression. We should then have the prophet quite reconciled with the apostle. Accept the resurrection to "shame" and to "glory" as being both of them quite applicable to the same persons! It is only calling it a "mysterious paradox" and the difficulty is over. It is not a whit more paradoxical than supposing the unjust in hell to be at the same time surrounded by the "blackness of darkness" and "brightness of the uncreated light." And by the aid of this little conjuring paradox Mr. Birks has the entire of 1 Cor. xv. to do what he likes with. Why, he can do a great deal more with it than he has ever attemped. With it he can throw Augustine, whom he evidently does not relish, overboard altogether, and appear before the world as the out-and-out disciple of Origen.

But we cannot abandon to the unjust, or to Mr. Birks, this grand chapter. It belongs exclusively to Christ, and to all who are Christ's. Bengel states the matter well when he says, "Paul here speaks *of the righteous,* of whom Christ is the first fruits: and these, as they all die in Adam, so also shall they all be made alive in Christ. *Scripture everywhere concerns itself with the faithful, and treats especially of their resurrection;* with regard to the *resurrection of the wicked it only treats of it in a casual incidental way*" (Bengel, in 1 Cor. xv. 22). The expression, "made alive," ζωοποιεω which Mr. Birks applies alike to the bodies of the unjust and the just is by St. Paul *expressly confined to the resurrection of the bodies of the just;* "*if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you,* He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also *quicken* (make alive ζωοποιεω) *your mortal bodies* by his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. viii. 11). Here the process of quickening the body, which Mr. Birks and so many of his school applies to the just and the unjust alike, is by the apostle Paul confined to the just; and, with that marvellous propriety of language which distinguishes Scripture above all other books, it will be found that throughout the New Testament this word "quicken" (ζωοποιεω) is only applied to the redeemed people of God either as referring to the renewing of their spirits or the resurrection of their bodies. The bodies of the wicked are raised: they are not quickened. *No change,* such as fits the bodies of the redeemed for immortality, *passes upon them.* This change is the peculiar property of the just. Such as the body of the unjust was sown such it shall be raised. It was sown in corruption, and shall be raised in corruption: it was sown in dishonour, and it shall be raised in shame:

Digitized by Google

it was sown in weakness, and it shall be raised in weakness; it was sown a natural body, and it shall be raised a natural body. Their corruptible never puts on incorruption, and their mortal never puts on immortality. Their resurrection differs in no material respect from the raising of the Shunammite's child in the Old Testament, from that of the raising of the widow's son or Lazarus in the New. These were raised, *but only to the old mortal state again.* No change for immortality passed upon them, and death in a few years a second time claimed them for his own. So it will be with the bodies of the wicked in their resurrection. They will be raised in their old mortality for punishment. Raised in mortality, the pains of hell will again, must again, reduce them to a second, and, in this case, an eternal death.

It is most instructive to see how the Augustinian theorists are ever grasping at some portion of Paul's grand chapter on the resurrection, and enlisting it on their own side. They feel instinctively that they must do so or give up their cause as hopeless. *For their horrible purpose the bodies of the wicked must be changed.* Bodies, such as we have now, mortal, weak, corruptible, could not endure pain and suffering for ever. They must, sooner or later, yield, as here they yield, to death. Hence ever we find the advocates of eternal life in hell, when they speak at all freely on the subject, using the phraseology of this fifteenth chapter of the first of Corinthians of the lost in hell. We find it alike in their poetry and their prose. Jonathan Edwards says, "The bodies of the wicked shall be so *changed* as to fit them for eternal torment *without corruption.*" Thomas Scott says, "the bodies of the wicked *will be rendered incorruptible.*" Pollok enriches his description of the lost with terms which Scripture has applied only to the redeemed, and uses with equal freedom the noble language of Paul and the enraptured poetry of its prophets:—

> "The good and evil, in a moment, all
> *Were changed,* corruptible to incorrupt,
> And mortal to immortal.
>
> "Her loud, uncircumcised, tempestuous crew—
> How ill-prepared to meet their God!—*were changed.*
>
> "revived,
> Rebuilt, *in union indestructible.*
> No atom of his spoils remained to Death.
> From his strong arm, by stronger arm released,
> Immortal now in soul and body both.
>
> "Now beyond thy vale (*i.e.*, Death's Vale),
> Stood all the *ransomed* multitude of men,
> Immortal all."*

Would not most men in reading these two last extracts from Pollok suppose that he was speaking of the redeemed? Are they not Hosea's magnificent language: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death; O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction" (chap. xiii. 14)? But the prophet applies them to the redeemed alone; Pollok and his school to the unjust as much. *They do not apply to these latter at all. Death is not destroyed for them.* Their

* Edwards on Redemption, Period iii., Part ii., sec. 2. Rev. T. Scott, Sermon xix. "On the Resurrection"—Pollok's Course of Time. Book viii.

Digitized by Google

resurrection is not that of Christ's people who, being made equal to the angels, *cannot die any more.* (Luke xx. 36.) Their resurrection is not like that of Christ who, "being raised from the dead, *dieth no more.*" (Rom. vi. 9.) The wicked are for a period raised in order that, suffering in their bodies the due reward for their deeds, which here they have not, they may be handed over to the eternal dominion of the second death.

Having come thus far in our review of Mr. Birks, we must express that in one respect our view of his theory has undergone a change. We gave him in our first paper the credit of bringing forward "*a new thing.*" We now withdraw whatever merit may be supposed to be attached to originality. When the Centaur was first exhibited in an ancient work of art many probably exclaimed, "*look at the new creature!*" When the wonder was over they perceived that it was only a jumble of two old creatures, a man and a horse, and that it had no existence in nature. It was not the product of the time when original genius took its most daring flight, but when art, separated from genius, sought to supply its absence by monstrous births. Such is this theory of Mr. Birks. It is only a sorry mixture of the two old theories of Origen and Augustine. Augustine's grim face is made to wear a ghastly smile, and Origen's joyous countenance is overshadowed with the darkness of hell. Thank God, this miserable picture has no more reality in theology than the Centaur had in nature. God's world has no monsters of either kind.

For this unhappy theory presents to our minds no victory of divine goodness over evil. In it we see neither sin nor misery rooted out. The old will is crushed, but it is not changed. The shades of eternal sorrow still settle over hearts which were made for unmingled joy. A more melancholy picture to present to our contemplation, and to call a victory of divine goodness, has never been attempted.

With our reader's permission we will now endeavour to show that the theory which we put forward as God's truth, namely, that punishment of the wicked, which consists in their eternal death, is a true, real, glorious victory of divine goodness over evil. If we were only to regard the wicked themselves, it would be a far truer victory over evil than Mr. Birks' view presents, and is, moreover, the very way in which God ordained that evil should be put away from among the congregation of Israel, which typifies the church of the future. (Deut. xix. 13, 19.) But we believe, and we think also that Scripture bears out our belief, that the punishment of hell is intended to influence, and will influence, God's creation throughout its widest extent. In this influence for good will consist, we believe, the truest victory of divine goodness displayed in the destruction of the wicked, and which could in no other way be brought about.

We must keep in mind *the great object of punishment.* With a just ruler this object is never pain inflicted in a spirit of hatred, or pain greater than the offence deserved. With a just ruler *retribution,* no doubt, *is an end, but it is the least end in punishment.* His great end is *prevention.* In the punishment of offenders he always has more regard to the law keepers than to the law breakers. Protection to the former in their lawful callings; warning to them against the imitation of crime; these are the great ends aimed at by wise and just rulers in punishment of actual crime. Regard to these will be the great ruling motive in the regulation

Digitized by Google

of punishment. Regard to these will operate *most powerfully* on the treatment of the criminal. At one time it will demand a sternness in punishment all but bordering on actual injustice to the individual punished. Regard for society may, in another aspect, mitigate to a most serious extent the punishment justly due to his crime. But, regard to society in all its branches and all its interests, is the grand aim in all wise human legislation on crime; and that legislator has shown the highest wisdom who, while never transgressing the limits of justice, has so arranged his penal code that it has had the greatest effect possible in protecting the law-respecting community in their minutest rights, and providing that they shall never degenerate into the condition of the law-breaking classes. All severity, short of injustice, is not only wise, but is *most merciful*, that has this effect.

Now it is in this light that we are to view future punishment. To say that what we call the fall of angels was the first appearance of moral evil is to say what cannot with certainty be affirmed. All that we can say with certainty is, that it was the beginning of that outburst of moral evil with which we are connected, and in which, as regards us, the redemption of Christ has interposed. Our opinion is that the outburst of evil, which began with the angelic fall and spread on to the fall of man, is positively the first appearance of moral evil in the universe of God. But we cannot here dogmatise. What we are much more strongly persuaded of is that, if not the first, it will be the last. We know from Scripture that this outburst of evil will be obliterated and become extinct. We think we see, with almost equal certainty, that evil will break out no more.

But God in dealing with the higher orders of his creatures is dealing, not with lifeless matter, not with living things walking by a law of necessity, but with living creatures under the high and elevating, but also *most perilous condition of a free will*. Free to choose the good, and to rise on the wings of goodness to God, its source, and to enjoy the immortality of God. *As free* to choose the evil, and to sink beneath its weight to depths of utter darkness. Nor is this an imaginary danger, a theoretical possibility, to be discussed as a school problem, but never to be met with in reality. That which was possible in theory is true in fact. Angels—we know not how many, but we know that they are many—who once walked in holiness used their freewill to range themselves in opposition to God. Man, a weaker and a lower creature, yet inexperienced and unsuspecting, at the instigation of a higher intelligence, also uses his free will to depart from God. And so, in these various ways, in these various shades of original guilt, sin entered into God's universe, and produced evil effects, of which we know something from what we daily hear and see, but whose full consequences are only known to God.

But this is not all. There is the very same possibility and danger of further fall that there ever was. It may be that the angelic world of past creation are so fortified and strengthened by what they have already seen of the evil of sin, that with them there is no moral possibility of further fall. But we have no reason for supposing that among the spheres are no creatures such as we. Nor have we the smallest reason for supposing that God has come to the limit of his creative energy and will. He is not the inactive God of an Epicurean philosophy, reposing in dreary self-satisfied contemplation. He is a God who delights to be at work,

Digitized by Google

and the spirit he breathes into all his creatures is a love of work. (John v. 1.7) Look at the earth. It affords innumerable evidences of his busy hand and brain. Look at the stars. Doubtless they show the same ceaseless energy of God. But we know that he is not content with the creation only of the lower organisations. He delights to form creatures that know with a conscious love their Maker, and in this knowledge rise higher and higher, nearer and yet more near to their source. Who can place limits to the future expansion of our race when the consummation has come? Who can say with any faint shadow of probability that God will close his creation with man? Even while we write, or while we read, there may be reproducing in some distant planet, whose geological changes have come to their required perfection, the fac-simile of the scene in Eden six thousand years ago. Or who can say that it may not be ours as the ages of our blessed future roll on—our own days of marrying and giving in marriage only existing in the memory—to see what angels saw here once, a figure of noble front and faultless form rising from the earth in the majesty of perfect manhood, and God placing in his thrilling grasp the yielding hand of woman as lovely in face as she is innocent in mind, and saying in words that should cover with shame all who derogate from God's holy ordinance of marriage—"Increase, and multiply, and replenish the world I have given you."

But, these are races made under free-will! It may be that some of them in their beginning are no higher than we were in ours. Eve does not seem to have been before the fall much wiser than she was after it. A woman without guile, without suspicion, without experience, loving, curious, credulous. Do you reject the picture? It is not ours: it is what we see on the canvas of Scripture. Adam was apparently in much resembling many of his sons. Ardent, hasty, impetuous, at a beautiful woman's solicitation he threw away, with open eyes, duty and loyalty; without her he will not live—with her he will die. And what were the consequences? We read them—outside Eden, in the deluge, at Sodom, in Potiphar's house, in the wars of Canaan, on the hill of Calvary, at the siege of Jerusalem, in the shouts of the Goths and Vandals, in the crusaders' wars, in the massacre of Bartholomew, in the snows of Russia, in the glittering scenes of heartless vanity, in the morbid passions and stunted affections of conventual imprisonment, in the gambling tables of Baden, in the lust markets of Paris and London. We read them in our world's history of crime, and sin, and sorrow, and death.

Now, the divine code of punishment, from the expulsion from Eden and the growth of the thistle, down to the closing punishment of hell, has regard to the various, complicated, universal interests of the higher creation, wherever it may now, or will hereafter exist. It is not solely, we say it is not chiefly, for those to whom it shall be said—"depart into everlasting fire." We are by no means prepared to say that if fallen men, ay, and even fallen angels, had alone been in question, their treatment by God might not have been widely different. Had they alone been in question we dare not confine the efforts at their recovery to those which have actually been made. Christ might in that case have taken hold of angels, instead of putting forth redemption only for the sons of Abraham. Man's day of grace might not in that case have been confined to his life here from the cradle to the grave, but grace might have followed him on

Digitized by Google

from age to age, and world to world, ere it ceased to strive to win back those who had once offered to God the pure incense of a creature's praise, who had once felt the ennobling emotion of the heart's love and worship of God.

So it has not been. Angels fell. No saving hand was stretched from the throne to raise them up; no Son of God went forth to war for them. Man fell. The Son rose up from the place of honour, and said to his Father, "Here I am, send me"; and he laid aside his majesty, and he emptied himself, and he became a man, and for man he bore shame, and rejection, and the death upon the cross. "Not in vain," sounds forth that voice of grateful love which has been growing and swelling from the small voice outside the gates of Eden, to the voice of many waters within the gates of the New Jerusalem. But—how many left behind! How many voices silent! How many pulsations of life stilled for evermore!

Our thoughts revert to Wellington as he saw the army of Spain crossing the Bidassoa, after the retreating soldiers of France. By him went the flowing plumes, by him rolled the heavy guns, by him marched, with dauntless heart, the matchless infantry of Britain, in nobler array, in denser bands than had marched under their leader's eye at the great soldier's opening victory at Vimeira. *But few of those first soldiers are crossing into France under Wellington's eye.* At various intervals they are left behind. On the first battlefield of the Peninsula, on the heights of Busaco, in the bloody struggle of Fuentes de Onoro, by the towers of Salamanca, on the breach of St. Sebastian; at Vittoria beneath the shadow of the Pyrenees, along the whole line of victorious march, lie the bones of those who never gazed on French ground from the slopes of the mountains, or saw the spray of the waves as they broke in white foam on the bar of the Bidassoa. So will it be in the great muster roll of heaven. Many are called, few are chosen to eternal life.

Now, what we say is this: Doubtless with a merciful view to others—to others, perhaps, as far exceeding in number, the number of the lost, as the sands of all old ocean's shores exceed those of its smallest strand—has the punishment of the various classes consigned at the judgment to hell been decreed. In that of angels will be seen the *danger of one irrevocable step*, where no hand was put forth to save, where, perhaps, no wish was ever felt to return. As regards men, some in all ages, even the darkest, were saved from the effects of a step which, in their case, was not irrevocable: but how various the degrees of guilt and opportunity among others, all of whom yet endured one irrevocable sentence! To some Christ was preached with all the circumstances that could win back the heart, with all the earnestness that could secure the love. No response came from that wilful heart: it closed up all the avenues that could lead to repentance, and went on resolutely to perdition. "But," it might be suggested, "at least there will be such an effort made; we shall not, if we fall, find ourselves ushered into a doom of which we knew little beyond what some faint indistinct fears and misgivings may darkly insinuate." Yet even such God's dealings with our race show us may be the case. For ages he left the generations of the world *to themselves*. A glimmering tradition, a darkened conscience, nature's indications of a Great Being in whom love and justice, and judgment, and power, had each a place—these were all myriads had to guide them to the brink of that last step which each one

Digitized by Google

must take for himself, and by himself, unto the dark world beyond. We do not affirm or believe of the heathen that all are lost; but we do know from Scripture that *as a rule* their future is without hope. Light enough to condemn, but not enough to save: light so little as to reduce their guilt to its minimum, but not to make them guiltless: and yet with this small amount of light and of guilt they endure the second and endless death. And who dare say, with Christ's words in his ears, that none of these lost ones would have heard and hailed to life eternal the words of Christ's gospel, if they had been addressed to them by the Master or by his disciples. From Sodom and Gomorra, from Tyre and Sidon, he tells us souls would have sprung forth to the living call which was heard and unheeded by the callous hearts of Chorazin and Capernaum (Matt. xi. 21). But no such call was heard amid the vice of Sodom: no such call mingled with the din of the mariners of Tyre or with the beating of its waves. They sinned without law, and they perish without law; for them it will be more tolerable than for others in the day of judgment, but they will not for all that escape its endless sentence.

We acknowledge that there is *severity* in this. Augustine's sentence on such is one of the blackest and most cruel tyranny and *injustice*: even in the scriptural sentence of death there is *severity*. But we cannot quarrel with severity, if it has no taint of injustice. God tells us that he sometimes acts with severity (Rom. xi. 22). If he had not told us so in his word we should have known it from his other great book of nature, whose pages have been open to all eyes, and in which lessons of severity are read as it enters each age's record on its tablet of stone. Severity in the future world, if it be not unjust, is no argument against any religious theory. If any one will say it is, he must take his stand *on atheistic ground*. And poor after all is the assurance which atheism can afford. If here is life which no God gave us, who can say we might not find such a life beyond the grave? If here on earth are, as no doubt there are, places which may vie with almost any pictures of a future hell, in misery, guilt, and despair, will the atheist tell us that such may not exist in the hereafter as well? Even for him it is better to come back to a belief in God. But with the *theist* we will allow of no argument against a theory which has in it an element of severity. Let him first eliminate severity from *his book of God, his inspired record, his infallible interpreter of divine secrets*, the roll of nature through her mighty annals, before we will hear of one word of complaint *from him* that in the Christian's book of God there is the record of severity past or to come.

And may we not even here see mercy beaming forth? In all judgment we believe that God remembers mercy, and that mercy is kept full in mind in the judgment on fallen angels, and reprobate men of every shade of guilt. God's higher orders of creation have all to walk along the perilous course of free-will in order to attain each the end of their being. There are rocks, shoals, quicksands by their way. Each rock has witnessed the wreck of some gallant ship; each shoal is strewn with fragments; each quicksand has swallowed up brave beating hearts. But straightway has risen up the beacon on the headland, the lighthouse on the reef, the deep-toned bell floating over the sands, and sending its solemn warning across the treacherous waves; and fleets traverse in safety where now one and now another noble vessel had been dashed in pieces and gone down. We

Digitized by Google

feel satisfied we are not drawing on imagination for what we say. We know that, in the path which race after race has to tread, there is danger of falling. We know that, called to go up higher, even to the top of God's mount, they may fall headlong. We are satisfied that the divine jurisprudence regards the welfare of the great numbers as its paramount consideration. We see the important bearing of future punishment as it is revealed in Scripture, severe but never unjust, on this widely stretching interest of unbounded space, of eternal duration. We see how every shade of severity tells on some vast destiny of the future, from the severity which punishes where the hands had been vainly stretched out all the day long, and the pleading voice had been mocked at, to the severity which punishes where no clear voice had ever spoken, and where, if such a voice had spoken it would have been heard. To none, no, not the least guilty, is wrong done when God withdraws from the dim child of savage nature, or as the dim child of the dark circles which lie within the surrounding of our most vaunted civilisation, the life he withdraws from the angel above him, from the beast scarce below him. But to numbers without numbers, may this act, to us bordering upon injustice, but not entering one hair-breadth within its domain, be an act of supremest mercy, love, and wisdom; for surely that conduct of God is most wise, most loving, most merciful, which, through a severity of which they have lost the feeling, has made to countless others the ennobling and exalting path of free-will to be as safe as to the lower creatures is their ignoble path of necessity.

Milton, in his "Paradise Lost," relates what he supposes may have passed in conversation between angels and our first parents before their fall. The mind of our great poet was traversing here that very line of thought which we have been endeavouring to pursue. He contemplated man, without experience, yet of necessity placed in the post of danger. Eden had its joys, its peace, its progress: *it must have its peril.* Among "the trees yielding fruit, whose seed was in themselves," which the earth brought forth on the third day of creation, we know that there were not two trees of an after growth. (Gen. i. 12, ii. 9.) We know that it was not till after man was made that they appeared. We also know that they appeared together, growing up at the same time, side by side. We know that, simultaneously with the tree of life, the emblem and pledge of safety, grew the tree of knowledge of good and evil, the sign of a possible ruin. We know that this must be so, since man was higher than the brutes, only a little lower than the angels. That tree of life, conferring God's immortality, could not be hung with its precious fruit, unless the deadly fruit of its neighbour tree hung close beside. It is only saying that Eden was to man the land of Free Will, and therefore of a possible immortality, and of as possible a death. Under such circumstances, Milton brings before us Raphael relating to Adam the Angelic Fall. It was the Angelic Architect building up before the sailor's eye the beacon on the rock. It was the Ministering Spirit telling one child of free will, of the pitfall into which another and yet brighter child had fallen. It was without avail. As one race fell, so fell another; and down, from that day to this, and from this day to the closing scene of this earth's history, has been seen, and will be seen, that the pathway of the higher creation is beset with danger. In life restored through Christ, in death incurred without Christ, this history of evil, in which the angelic and the human race are so blended and mixed up together, is concluded.

Digitized by Google

It may be a part of our office in the coming age to point the moral of the marvellous parable to ears that hear it with more benefit than Adam listened to the tale brought from heaven by Raphael. We can then follow out to its close what the angel could only begin. We can then intertwine with the history of the higher race the fortunes of the lower, and carry on both to their common termination. We can tell of a race that in its fall had no redemption. We can tell of a redemption that visited another race—of its miracles of grace, of its final victory—but also of its utter failure to save in unnumbered instances. We can tell them that, not only obstinate guilt has its danger, but negligence, inexperience, ignorance, descending as an inheritance from generation to generation. And all is told to races rejoicing in the first flush of that life which beats tumultuously in the new-created. If the sinner's ruin is their safety, and his destruction their safeguard against loss, then even the sinner's ruin was not in vain, and we can find a great and precious truth in a Scripture at which we are sometimes inclined to stumble, that "the Lord hath made all things for himself, yea, even the wicked, for the day of evil." (Prov. xvi. 4.) The great stumbling block, the entrance of evil, will be a stumbling block no more. Evil is seen to exist, not with Augustine to be perpetuated for ever, but to be under the providence of the Great Sovereign and loving Father, *its own eternal destruction.*

And this conclusion of the matter will exhibit to us *the limits of that free will* into whose bounds we have ventured with hesitating step to enter. We do not think that we have done so without a guide more trustworthy than led Virgil through the realms of the Shades, or guided Dante through Purgatory and Paradise. *The free creature can defeat divine goodness for itself, but no farther.* His own good he may refuse, his own evil he may choose, and yet there may be designs in the great scheme of divine providence which in so doing he has unconsciously or unwillingly worked out. Such we know to be the case here. "God maketh the wrath of man, his sin, its end, to praise him." (Psa. lxxvi. 10.) The sinner has, no doubt, defeated God's goodness for himself—thrust back the proffered hand that was full of blessing—like the sullen child, retired into the darkness from the cheerful room where the fire blazed brightly, and brothers and sisters played and laughed; but he saw not a good glorious end which God brought about by his very conduct. Other worlds behold us: other worlds hear of us. There is a universal history of creation with which the history of each part is inseparably linked. Earth's drama—its gladness and its sadness, its sin and its holiness, its life and its death, its redemption embraced and rejected—is not an unconnected episode of a great poem, but is a mighty transaction of time in which all worlds and all beings take a share—God, and Angels, and Men—and which is to bear with a mighty bearing upon the ages of the future. So it is represented in Scripture. The puny sceptic, blear-eyed and short-sighted, may sneer at the thought of the trouble our world is said to have occasioned in the councils of heaven. Not so they who stand near the throne. Angels desire to look into these things: the conversion of a sinner is joy throughout their ranks. Here, in this remote sphere, things are doing, and will be done, which will tell on intelligences whose names and abodes will never reach our knowledge here. That fall of angels and of men which free-will made possible—that death among angels and men which the power of choice effected—

Digitized by Google

may, working only by moral means, make in the glorious realm of freedom another fall and another death *morally impossible.* The loss of life to some, possible from their place in creation, just in the dealings of God's jurisprudence, may be pure unmitigated mercy to the greater number. The permission of evil—of evil leading to one sad result in death—may issue in another result, *the eternal and undisturbed establishment of good.*

HENRY CONSTABLE,
Prebendary of Desertmore.

Desertmore Glebe.

OUR HEAVENLY RELATIONSHIP.

"For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ."—Phil. iii. 20.

THE signification which present usage attaches to the word "conversation" is that of colloquial intercourse, or talk. It is probable that many regard the above-quoted passage as a declaration, that Christians speak much of heavenly things. Now, the word *politeuma* here translated *conversation* is a derivate from the Greek word *polis,* a city, state, or commonwealth. In classic use, *politeuma* is often used as having the same sense with *polis.* It has been supposed by some, that *politeuma,* in the passage before us, signifies *citizenship,* or the municipal rights which belong to a citizen. There is, however, a want of authority for this signification. It is true that classical writers employ it to designate "the management of public affairs"—but when they would convey the idea of citizenship, they have recourse to the word *politeia.* The derivative verb *politeumai* occurs twice in the New Testament (Acts xxiii. 1): "Men and brethren, I have lived (*pepoliteumai, i.e.,* I have behaved) with all good conscience before God until this day;" (Phil. i. 27:) "Only let your conversation be (*polituesthe*—the imperative mode—"behave yourselves") as becometh the gospel of Christ." It is obvious, that the idea of a *regular course of life, such as would become the habitants of a well-ordered city belongs to the signification of the word.* In the passage under consideration, then, *politeuma* signifies *city,* and the verse should be translated, "For our city is in heaven, from whence we look for the Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ." Compare Rev. xxi. 10.

Politeuma occurs in no other place in the New Testament. In all other cases, except one, where *conversation* occurs, the Greek word is the noun, *anastrophe,* "behaviour," or "conduct," or some form of the verb *anatrepho*—"to behave, or conduct in any way." The exception is found in Heb. xiii. 15: "Let your conversation (*tropos,* "disposition") be without covetousness."—*Prof. Whiting.*

Digitized by Google

THE BURNING MOUNTAIN.

AMONGST the Scripture woes of the time of the end, as seen by St. John, is the portentous scene of a burning mountain, upheaved from its foundations and plunged into the depths of the sea. This stupendous overthrow is to be accompanied by a fearful destruction by sea and land. Let us dispassionately compare Scripture with Scripture; let us see what light is shed upon this terrible catastrophe by the Divine Revealer of Secrets, by his holy prophets of an earlier age. Beyond what is written let not conjecture venture to intrude.

Another scene of this drama of final tribulation is before as. Behold a scarlet-coloured beast, with seven heads; and on its brows names of blasphemy; it has ten horns; it ascends, or *is about to ascend* (μέλλει ἀναβαίνειν), *out of the bottomless pit.* Hence this portentous monster must be a different prodigy from the beast of the thirteenth chapter, which ascended *from the sea,* and which represents the last great potentate. This scarlet-coloured prodigy is none other than the great dragon, the old serpent, the devil, whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon; in the Greek, Apollyon, the Destroyer, Satanas, the Archfiend, soon to be revealed by his sevenfold names of blasphemies, in the dreadful events of the time of the end. No marvel that the last great potentate shall have his form: for is he not the foster-child of the ruler of the darkness of this world?

This marvel of woe is still further described as 'the beast that was and is not, and is yet to ascend' to earth. *Now* he 'is not' personally on the earth; he '*was*' here; he has been here; he has left earth *for a season,* and for a momentous season of woe is he to return to earth again; for five months of sore distress, and battle, and murder, and plague, and of tribulation, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time.

We have further descriptive particulars. We are told that the seven heads are seven mountains. "And there are seven kings," five of whom are fallen, and one is said to be in existence in St. John's time. Now, who are these *kings?* Certainly not *five* forms of power at Rome, such as Kings, Consuls, Dictators, Decemviri, Tribunes, Ædiles, Quæstors, and Prætors; for how can any but the first be dignified with the name of *kings?* How can these be said to have *fallen?* Were not some of these offices known under the emperorship in St. John's time? Such an interpretation as this must bring upon the student of prophecy the charge of clumsy accommodation. Upon which of these Roman officers shall we fix the distinguishing title of *kings?* It is known to every scholar that each of them in turn would have loathed the title. Then, again, the term '*fallen,*' to an English reader, and more especially the Greek word (ἔπεσεν) to the scholarly reader, will imply *violence, commotion, overthrow,* and not the succession of consuls, and so forth, by the suffrages of the "sovereign people." It implies the upheaval of some dynasty that has raised its towering head over the lesser hills of the surrounding peoples, and nations, and kindreds, and tongues. It might denote the fall of the four monarchies described by

Digitized by Google

Daniel; and as these are called '*kings*' in this sure word of prophecy, we have a clue to the solution of the symbol. In Daniel, *three* of the *five* fallen kings are named—the Chaldæan, the Persian, the Grecian dynasties. The other two are the Egyptian, the Assyrian, who were equally *heads* of the kingdoms of this world. Truly were they *incorporated with* the scarlet-coloured beast, who is lord of this world, and who 'giveth it to whomsoever he will.' Though he 'is not' personally manifest, yet he has been working in and by the children of disobedience.

His empires have fallen. *Egypt* has fallen, and become the basest of kingdoms. *Nineveh* has fallen into utter ruin. *Babylon* has fallen, and such desolation has reigned over its ruins, that it is the dwelling of the bittern and the owl; and not even will Arabia's desert-ranger pitch tent there. Persia and Græcia are fallen; and only now in these times of the end are they endeavouring to grasp at the shadows of past greatness. These *five* kings are *fallen;* the *sixth,* the Roman, in the time of St. John 'IS.' It was here in the zenith of its greatness. The other, the seventh, 'is not yet come.' He is the Prince of the people, that is to 'continue *but a short space,*' *i.e.,* for a week of years, the final hebdomad of these apocalyptic woes.

To distinguish this seven-headed beast from that of the thirteenth chapter, he is said to be *the eighth.* Hence he comes from his abysmal prison after the seventh; he will be in league with this last great potentate, *he will give him his power, his seat, his great authority,* as he did to Egypt, to Assyria, to Chaldæa, to Persia, and to Græcia of old. Yet another particular remains to be noted. This seven-headed monster had ten horns, which are ten kings. We know not whether any stress is to be laid upon the fact that the heads of the dragon are *crowned,* and that the ten horns are *not crowned* (Rev. xii. 3), whereas the heads of the last great potentate are *not* crowned, but his ten horns *are* crowned. It might seem to show that the great red dragon was the real monarch of the seven successive dynasties, and that the successive names famous in history were but his satraps, or lieutenants, or viceroys. May we not likewise infer that his decade of kings shall be diverse from the ten crowned kings in alliance with the last great potentate, which are the toes of the image, the ten horns of Daniel's hybrid beast. These *ten crowned* kings are to form a decemvirate of kingdoms, which are to be *incorporated in* alliance with the last potentate; these are to occupy, collectively, the territories of the colossal Roman empire: hence they may be described as kings of the west. And may it not be in contradistinction to these kings of the crowned decemvirate that the other decade of kings are called 'kings of the east' (xvi. 12), whose way is to be prepared by the drying up of the waters on which sits the queenly Babylon of the time of the end? These kings 'have no kingdom as yet;' but are ready to be revealed in these last times. They are in concert: 'they have one mind:' 'they will give their power and strength to the beast.' To which of these beasts? It seems to be immaterial, for they are in concert; they are both to do battle with him that is faithful and true. (Compare Rev. xvii. 14, with xix. 19). May not these be ten uncrowned leaders of the scorpion hosts, who shall have power on earth, insomuch that three hundred millions, or fully one-third of the inhabitants of the earth, shall perish by this plague! These prodigies of horror will also have some mysterious connection with the river of Babylon.

Digitized by Google

(Rev. ix. 14). But let us reserve the terrible exploits of this scarlet-coloured beast, and also of his decade of spirit-kings. Who shall live when Jehovah permits this?

Upon this monster is a rider. As yet the higher part of the picture only is developed; and we see but the bust of the rider. It is the form of a female; she is a queen, arrayed in purple and fine linen, bedizened with gold, and precious stones, and pearls. In her hand is a cup, a golden chalice, full of the love-potions of her witcheries. It is the cup of the enchantress, wherewith she has intoxicated the nations. With her the kings of this present evil world have lived deliciously. The hearts of the multitudes she has swayed with her despotism. She has lulled the consciences of nations to sleep with her shameless "indulgences." She has charmed them with her fatal fascinations. Know ye not her name? It is written upon her brow. It is MYSTERY. BABYLON THE GREAT. THE MOTHER OF *fornications. The Mother of the abominations of the Earth.* She who was once espoused as a chaste virgin to Christ, has forgotten the Guide of her youth. The Duke de Montmorency, who had the rare opportunity of examining the Tiara of the Popes of Rome, assures us that there is inscribed upon it, *Mystery;* and since the days of Paul II. A.D. 1464, that Tiara has been studded with gems.

Another of her names is Babylon, the Great. It will be asked why St. John saw the name of an ancient city, long buried in ruins, as the name of the Harlot Queen? we reply that this name was written to identify her with the city prophesied against in the Scripture lays of the time of the end. Jeremiah, long before had chaunted forth the dirge of this metropolis of the last times; and as we shall see, there is a striking parallelism between the dirge of the prophet and the vision of the Apocalypse. What more natural than that these ancient seers should designate the metropolis of the last great monarchy by the names of the greatest cities of their respective ages? Even thus in the reign of the good Hezekiah, Nahum sang the burden of Nineveh, not the capital of Assyria, to be laid waste within a century; but the metropolis of the last great Potentate of the time of the end. There are expressions in this sublime ode, which are only applicable to the circumstances of these later times of progress; and the following strains are graphically descriptive of the Harlot Queen (iii. 4, 7, 19).

"Because of the abundance of fornications of a harlot,
The goodness of the grace of the lady of witchcrafts,
Who selleth nations by her fornications,
And families by her witchcrafts,
Lo' I am against thee,
Sweareth Jehovah of hosts.
I have shewed nations thy nakedness,
I have removed thy skirts from thee,
And have shewed kingdoms thy shame.
And cast upon thee abominations,
Dishonoured thee and made thee a sight.
Each of thy beholders fleeth from thee,
And saith, Spoiled is Nineveh;
Who for her doth bewail?
Whence shall be comforters for thee?"

Digitized by Google

Need we prolong the strain to show the correspondence with the Apocalyptic vision? Listen to the last strains of the prophet of Galilee:

"There is no weakening of thy destruction;
Grievous is thy smiting;
All who hear thy tale clap the hand at thee;
For over whom passed not thy wickedness continually?"

It is even thus that another seer of Galilee tells of the fall of the harlot city. Isaiah sings the burden of this Babylon. It is too long for quotation, but there are passages in it which can only apply to the time of the end.

"Fierce with wrath and heat of anger;
When the sun in his going out is dark,
And the stars of the heavens
And the constellations
Cause not their light to shine,
And the moon causeth not its light to beam forth;
When the heaven's Jehovah maketh to tremble;
Even the earth to shake in her place,
In the wrath of Jehovah of hosts,
In the day of the heat of his anger."

A few years later Jeremiah also caught a glimpse of this terrible day of the Lord; he sees the Babylon of this time of tribulation, as "the golden cup" in the hand of Jehovah:

"Making drunk the whole earth,
From its wine the nations have drunk,
Therefore the nations boast themselves."

Gazing on another Babylon, rather than on the glory of the Chaldees' excellency, *which was remote from the sea,* Jeremiah exclaims:

"O thou that *dwellest amid the waters,*
Abundant in treasures,
Thine end hath come,
The measure of thy dishonest gain."

Looking upon a further vision, he sees her plunged into the sea of ruin, and exclaims:

"Lo! I am against thee, O destroying mount,
Sweareth Jehovah;
Thou hast destroyed the whole earth;
I have stretched forth my hand against thee,
I have rolled thee from the rocks,
And given thee for a burning mountain
And they take not of thee a stone for a corner;
Nor a stone for a foundation.
Thou art an everlasting desolation.
Come up against Babylon hath *the sea,*
With the multitudes of its billows
Is it covered.
Its billows asmany waters have sounded,
Their voice hath uttered its roar."

These prophetic words were designed not merely for the warning of the captives of Judah during the seventy years intervening between their utterance and the sacking of ancient Babylon by Cyrus; but rather as an heirloom of prophetic warning through each succeeding age, down to us "on whom the ends of the world are come," of the impending ruin of

Digitized by Google

the Nineveh, the Babylon of the last days, of which final woe the doom of these ancient cities was but the type of the assurance. It may be ours to read the fulfilment of these prophecies after the lapse of five and twenty centuries, in the doom of the harlot city, '*the flame of the sword.*' The flame of the sword! the lightning of the spear! What an ominous description of modern warfare! How otherwise could a poet of Nahum's remote age, describe these rifles, these needleguns, these chassepôts of our times? Look again on the prancing of mettlesome steeds, on the jumping of chariots, speeding swiftly like torches; on the numberless corpses of the slain. You are reading the words of Nahum, but you are looking at the vision of the Apocalypse. It is the funeral dirge of the mother of harlots. Thus terribly shall Babel fall! To identify her yet more strongly the home of this harlot is described; it is not on the plain of Mesopotamia, between the Tigris and Euphrates, on the site of ancient Babylon, but on the seven hills, beside the sea. Her home is Satan's seat; the den of the great red dragon that is about to ascend out of the bottomless pit. The seven heads are the seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth, the seven hilled city of the last empire. No marvel that he who is seventh, the last great potentate, should lend her his support, and should ostentatiously boast himself as the eldest son of this unfaithful bride. For she is supported by a greater than he, even by the eighth, who was, and is not, but who yet shall be.

But how foully has she fallen! Well might St. John, as he beheld, be confounded with a great amazement! 'A city of blood' is she in very deed. Drunken with blood, with the blood of the saints, the martyrs of Jesus. We have read the sad details of the persecutions of Pagan Rome, of the cruelties of Nero, Domitian, Diocletian, Julian, and others of infamous renown. But where Pagan Rome hath slain her thousands, she of the Papacy hath slain her tens of thousands. Bear witness, ye martyrs of Piedmont; ye Vaudois, ye Albigenses, illustrious heroes in the annals of the human race. Attest, ye scathing flames, ye tormenting racks of most refined cruelty. Ye murderers of the Inquisition, Jehovah is about to make inquisition for the blood of his slain!

Torquemada, who held the office of Inquisitor-General for fourteen years, used to make his boast that he had burned alive with august and solemn pomp, no fewer than six thousand heretics. The execrable Duke of Alva glorified himself in having butchered thirty-six thousand in the Netherlands, who had committed no other crime than protesting faith in Jesus. By the *auto-da-fé* of the Spanish Inquisition there perished by deaths of untold horrors, one hundred and fifty thousand of the noble confessors of Jesus. How shall we recount the horrors of St. Bartholomew's eve, or of the Irish massacre in 1641. One million bled in France, a million more in Spain! and in other nations thousands, myriads more. These are thy noble witnesses, thou King of kings. They shall not be forgotten of thee! The city of blood is about to come into remembrance before thee, and receive at thy holy hand double for all her sin.

Let us remark that, true to history, this harlot is not represented as part of the beast, as a head, like Babylon, or even Rome; but as separate from him, a rider. She was a church—faithful, precious—but the faithful city hath become a harlot!

The futurist scheme of interpretation has been charged with throwing

Digitized by Google

into shadow the Apostate Church of Rome; and because it does not make her *a man*, the "Man of Sin," the Antichrist, dark hints have been thrown out of 'indifference to Popery,' of 'Romanising tendencies,' of 'Ritualistic proclivities,' of 'Colensic scepticism,' of coquetries with the harlot-queen; but verily no such charge can justly be brought against the writers in the *Rainbow*. Such truths as the *Rainbow* proclaims must ever entail the ban of the Vatican, and of every other government hating light and its terrible revealings.

Where is Popery in this last drama? Behold the harlot in her shame! For twelve hundred and sixty years has she played her part, decked out in meretricious tawdriness, alluring the world to ruin, death, hell. Behold her sad career during the last twelve hundred and sixty days!

Her end is very nigh; widespread is the impression that Pio Nino is to be the very last of the Popes. We are told that, of the numerous niches in the walls of St. Peter's at Rome, made for the reception of the statues of the Popes, only one remains to be filled up. Filled up also is the cup of her iniquities, even to overflowing, and her time is short, very short. All agree that she hath well-nigh filled up the measure of her days; her twelve hundred and sixty years of crime. This merciless murderess, foremost among persecutors, is about to be repaid with full requital, with Jehovah's 'double,' for all her sins. Soon shall the shrill trumpet utter forth its clarion call. The monster dragon, by whose power she hath asserted her universal *catholic* pre-eminence, shall cast off the queenly rider, and plunge her headlong into ruin and woe. Volcanic fires shall do Jehovah's bidding. Vesuvius is very nigh; Ætna is not far away; volcanic agency is at work in the doomed land around the last great metropolis. Subterranean fires even now are sapping and mining the foundations. There shall be earthquakes in divers places, premonitory of woe. There shall be most strange commotions of the sea. At length the pent-up fires of earth, stored up for this, the day of Jehovah's anger, shall burst forth, and what was but yesterday, the sumptuous, luxurious mart of commerce, the giant metropolis of the world, filled with life, with wealth, with crime, shall be a huge blazing mass of ruin, vomited forth as a most loathsome thing from the crater of a strange volcano; and cities far away shall totter at her fall. The waters of the Mediterranean sea, but lately cærulean, clear, to a third of its breadth, is strewn with wreck, with gory carcasses, 'even as the blood of a dead man.' Its harbours, but yesterday filled with the iron fleets of remote lands, freighted with supplies—those harbours are now surging with boiling billows 'incarnadined' with death. Alas! alas! for that great city! She shall indeed come into the remembrance of an avenging God. Her golden cup shall become a cup of trembling, a vial of unmixed wrath. Instead of wine, this cup is filled with blood. Instead of mirth and revelries, are confusion and trembling; and then, in one hour, a crash of irretrievable ruin. Alas! for the panic-stricken world! Dreadful shall be the consternation; loud shall be the wail. But louder still shall be the shout of victory, the prolonged acclaim of the Lord's redeemed. The crimsoned waves shall roll into the deep the carcasses of the many slain, stricken down by the arrows of the Lord; a sea of death shall settle over that great city, that has been guilty as Sodom, and abandoned as Gomorrah. Thus terribly shall Babel fall. In *an hour* her plagues come; in *one hour* shall her

Digitized by Google

magnificence be despoiled, her marvellous riches be brought to nought; in *one hour*, shall the populous, the luxurious city, become an utter desolation. She shall expiate her witchcrafts by being burned alive on the pyre of her magnificence, and none shall deliver her. Then shall be chanted forth this strain from an ancient lay:—

"In a moment, in one day,
Come upon thee these two things—
Childlessness and widowhood;
According to their perfection,
They have come unto thee.
In the multitude of thy sorceries,
In the exceeding might of thy charms,
Come on thee doth evil;
Thou knowest not its rising:
Desolation cometh on thee suddenly;
Thou knowest not."

Loud and widespread shall be the lamentation upon earth during the brief remant of the time of the end. "Weeping and wailing they shall cry, Alas! alas! for that great city; wherein were made rich all that had ships in the sea by reason of costliness, for in one hour shall she be made desolate."

"Rejoice over her, thou heaven;
Ye prophets and holy apostles;
Your blood hath Jehovah avenged."

Direful have been the alarm notes of these trumpets of warning. Terrific have been the outpourings of these apocalyptic vials of woe. Say not that any such can ever have been poured out upon this world of ours during the past dispensation of mercy and salvation. Nay, rather, they are the skirmishers of Jehovah's fierce army of sore judgments; the preude of the world's catastrophe; the inauguration of the great and terrible day of the wrath of the Lamb. W. F.

LETTERS ON THEMES OF DEEPEST MOMENT.

Sextus Calpurnius to his dearest Mother, greeting.

IV.

OUR kinsman, Cornelius, has forwarded from Cæsarea your precious letter in reply to my last but one. I am very eager to read what you will write as to my last, so full of wonders; surely such marvels have never been heretofore enacted upon the stage of time. My present letter will hardly surprise you, for you must be prepared for anything I may write.

When we were at Tabor, we contrived to spend the Sabbaths of the Jews at Nain. One Sabbath we spent at the house of Simon, our Pharisee friend; the other we spent with the widow and her son. We had to descend the mount, and to get within the gate of the little town before sunset of

Digitized by Google

the preceding day, when the Sabbath commenced; for the Jewish law, or at any rate, Jewish usage forbids a longer journey than two thousand paces on their Sabbath-days. At the house of Simon the day was spent lugubriously enough; and I should have been dull indeed, but for the enlivening and ever-instructive conversation of Jehoiada. The day was a fast rather than a festival, and was observed with the most burdensome ceremonial. No fire was lighted, or replenished with fuel, although it was midwinter; no food was prepared, but the table was laid out on the previous day with bread of the coarsest quality, and a few dried herbs. What a contrast to the munificent, nay, ostentatiously extravagant entertainment to which I alluded in my last. At that feast we were regaled with all the delicacies of the season; it really does seem as if these Pharisees tried to make a display before men of their *fasting* as well as their *feasting*. My heart reproaches me with writing with the least disparagement of one at whose board I have been welcomed; but I am merely recording to my mother my protest against the intense Pharisaism of this age. Oh, how very different was the Sabbath at the widow's home! The meals were frugal, and equally unprepared; but each simple repast seemed to be a feast of love. I cannot do adequate justice to the sanctity of this dear family; but with the fascinating converse of Jehoiada, the widow Naomi, and her holy son, that Sabbath was a *rest* indeed, a *rest* of the purest enjoyment.

The memory of these Nain Sabbaths has been brought back by our precious sabbaths at Capernaum. We all worship in the synagogue of Leonatus. The prayers are most beautiful; uttered with the eloquent heart-feeling of our beloved Chazan, they thrill the very soul. Oh, how rejoiced am I that my dear father made me so familiar with this Hebrew language from my youth up. I have no difficulty whatever in accompanying my friends in their supplications. As a Gentile I have to take the very lowest seat in the synagogue, with Leonatus himself; but Jehoiada makes it the very highest post of honour by sitting at my side. Our friend Jairus always embraces the opportunity of the presence of Jehoiada to ask him to read and expound the sacred writings; and crowds throng to our synagogue when he is known to be at Capernaum.

On the first Sabbath after our arrival he put the question, What think ye of the Anointed One? and then answered his own question by answering that Jesus of Nazareth exactly fulfilled, in many a striking particular, what prophets had sung long centuries ago. Especially did he extol the land of Zebulon and the land of Napthali, his own loved tribe land. On a second Sabbath he related his wondrous experiences, when guided by the meteor-light across the desert wastes intervening between his native land and this land of his forefathers. Oh, how he spoke of the Star of Jacob and the Sceptre of Israel! His perorations are grand indeed! and the hearts of this people must in very deed have waxen gross, if they fail to be convinced by such eloquence.

On a third Sabbath was Jehoiada called to the rostrum, and again he put the same enquiry, What think ye of the Anointed One? What sentiments do ye entertain concerning the Messiah, who is to come to his people? Is it possible that he can put forth greater miracles than those wrought amongst your own selves by Jesus of Nazareth? Then he pointed to not a few, in that very synagogue, who had felt the healing power of Jesus. There was one who had stretched forth his arm that had long

Digitized by Google

been dried up and withered. There was another who had been possessed of an evil demon; not only so, but he was blind; nay, not only blind, but dumb also, and unable to crave the alms he so much needed. Behold him in your synagogue; and he, of whom our friend spoke, arose and glorified God in the presence of them all. "Yes," exclaimed this healed one out the fulness of his heart, "do ye not remember how ye all cried aloud, Is not this the Son of David?" Then Jehoiada reminded them of him that was borne of four upon his bed; and how they broke through the roof of the upper chamber, to let down their palsied friend to the feet of Jesus. It were easy to see which were the healed ones in that assembly; and when Jehoiada wound up these arguments with one of the most eloquent perorations I ever heard, conviction was irresistible. With his sweet, clear, musical voice, which you so well remember, he struck up a well-known chorus; and that spell-bound assembly at once joined the strain, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." When Jehoiada had resumed his seat between me and Leonatus, the chief ruler arose, and in a most touching manner related the story of the recall to life of his darling Miriam, to which Jehoiada had forborne to allude from feelings of delicacy. Nor did Jairus forget to rehearse the wondrous cure of Leonatus' freedman, at the distance of a day's journey.

Oh, what a happy Sabbath was that! only equalled perhaps by the last of all, when Jairus begged that two strangers from Cana would relate their experience of the Shiloh. Then rose Nathanael Bar-Tolmai (Bartholomew we call him to distinguish him from one or two other Nathanaels); the other was Simon, the zealot, of whom also I wrote you as friends of Jehoiada. These each recited how they had just returned from a mission on which they had been sent, two-and-two, by their Master. Their mission was to proclaim the kingdom of God as nigh at hand. Each had been on a different circuit. Nathanael had as his associate Philip of Bethsaida, whilst Simon had been accompanied by Judas, also called Thaddeus. How fascinating were the recitals of these unlettered men, whose very speech betrayed that they were men of Galilee. They were not only empowered to preach with the fluency of the skilled rhetorician, but even to work miracles; even demons were subject to them in the name of Jesus. Yes! they assured us that they could only perform these miracles in the name of Jesus of Nazareth. They even met with one who had such implicit trust in the name of Jesus, that he also cast out demons in this self-same name. When these Canaanites had finished, our old friend arose, and supplemented their narratives with his former enquiry, What think ye of the Anointed One? I wonder that any one can reject such accumulating evidence that Jesus of Nazareth is he that should come; and yet Jehoiada assures me that he is despised and set at nought by the nation at large. Nay, this very rejection only seems to strengthen our friend's trust in him; for, says he, thus is it written of him! It is perfectly astounding what a vast number of people are possessed by demons in this country. Most malignant, too, are these spirits of evil. Jehoiada thinks that the reason is that the omnipotence of the Shiloh may be more signally manifested by their dispossession. Another suggests that the world was never so fitted for the companionship of these spirits of evil; never was wickedness so rife, so flagrant; that the evil passions of men have allured them from the unseen world; that these outward manifestations of evil are but the

Digitized by Google

developments of still more terrible evil of the innermost hearts of men. Their presence, their fearful operations, attest unequivocally that we are living in a most solemn state of things; that there are existences upon this earth of ours not the less real because unseen. I saw the other day a young lad foaming at the mouth, roaring like a Mauritanian lion, wallowing in the mire, scorched most frightfully all over his body and face; for he had been plunged into water and into fire. I saw another, not only grievously tormented, writhing in extreme agonies, but bereft of speech also, that he might not cry for aid. Oh, these portentous forms of evil! of whose existence I had never dreamed, save in the fables of our poets, which not even the schoolboy believes. In this land of marvels, these monsters act out their fearful part before our very eyes. But I have been assured over and over again that these inexorable ones are aghast at the presence of Jesus of Nazareth. Some have openly confessed him to be the very Son of the Highest. Verily, they ought to know him—these supernatural beings. And yet, my dearest mother, so envenomed is the malice of the Pharisees against the Nazarene, that they are propagating the most absurd lie that he casteth out demons through the aid of the Prince of Demons. One went so far as to dare to assert that he was even possessed of a demon.

Since I wrote the above, a few days ago, a large party of us formed an excursion across the lake: our old friend Jonas, dove-like in nature as in name, placed his boat at our disposal: and so we determined to visit the shores of Gadara, and Gergesa, and the hills of Bashan or Batanæa, as this region is now called. Our party consisted of Simon and Andrew, the old man's two sons; of Jacob and John; who were partners with them in their fishing-trade once, and were now partners with them in being disciples of the Nazarene Jesus. Then there was one Levi, Ben-Alphæus, who had been our customs'-officer at Capernaum; Leonatus, Jairus, my indispensable friend Jehoiada, and Sextus Calpurnius. If I mistake not, these noble Galilæans will hold a foremost place in the future annals of the world: they must be men of parts, men of mind, men of power, or they would not have been selected by the Anointed One as his Shilohs or Apostles. When I was whispering these my reflections into the ear of Jehoiada, as we sat side by side, this far-seeing deep thinker observed, that he at once accepted my first inference; they would eclipse the fame of most men in the chronicles of the kingdom of Messiah: but the rest he would not allow; for he said that the Messiah would choose men of low degree, and of uneducated minds, that the agency might be seen to be more immediately from himself; then he confirmed his view, as he ever does, by a citation from one of the old prophets, 'Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith Jehovah of the hosts above.' But, added he, I yield to no man in love and admiration of these noble men. The eldest and the youngest of this little band, Simon and John, may indeed be chiefs amongst their brethren; but it will be in laborious toil and self-denying zeal.' I then left him to sit beside Levi; he had held an excellent position among the capernastes; but had surrendered all to be a more constant attendant upon his beloved Master. He gave me a sad account of the extortions of our Publicani; these men farm the public taxes from the governor, and are most rigorous in their exactions. As none but the most avaricious of the Jews will consent to accept this most invidious office, we have had to content ourselves with the services of a most sordid, and

Digitized by Google

mean race of tax-gatherers. This is one of the abuses, which I have set myself to reform. This Levi is a thorough Jew; he always speaks of Jerusalem as 'the holy city;' and never eats with us Gentiles, nor with unwashed hands. Of Andrew and Jacob I had not opportunity of judging; but they are great friends of Jairus; and with him and Leonatus, they conversed throughout our voyage. Jehoiada was with Simon and the younger son of Zebedee. I love this young man most dearly; he is what I should imagine Jehoiada to have been in the days when my beloved father first knew him, and when they joined you at Baiæ, about a year before my birth. Jehoiada tells me that this youth and his elder brother, Jacob, were men of very impetuous passions; that as they were passing through a village of Samaria, their Master received some insult, and these ardent disciples wanted him to call down fire from the skies, even as Elisha did in the days of old; he tells me also that their Master called them sons of thunder, on account of this impetuosity of temper; he adds, that this wondrous change in the disposition of this amiable youth has been brought about by intimacy with Jesus, who is so meek and lowly in heart. Most pleasurable was that voyage; old Jonas was at the helm of our craft, and the four partners attended to the sails, even as the gusts of wind veered from time to time. So clear was the winter sky, that we had not lost sight of the head-lands of Capernaum, before the bold bluffs of Batanæa appeared in view. Thus with these beacon-marks constantly in sight, steering was easy work on the crystal lake. Here you realise the *ανη-ριθμον γελασμα* of old Aeschylus, the countless dimples on the lake's fair cheek.

As we sighted the bluffs of Gadara the conversation became general. The old helmsman asked his lads if they could ever forget that rough dark night, when the gale arose so suddenly, and the heavy sea struck athwart ship, and well-nigh filled this little smack to sinking. 'Yes!' said the younger son of Zebedee, and how sweetly was Jesus sleeping in this hinder part of the vessel.' 'And with what alacrity,' said Andrew, 'did he arise, at our loud cries for help.' 'Yea!' answered Jacob, 'with what majesty he arose and rebuked the wind, as though it had been an evil dæmon.' 'You remember the very word he made use of,' said Simon. '*Be thou muzzled!* he said to the stormy wind, as though it had been a mad dog, or an evil dæmon, as you suggest.' 'Well,' replied Jacob, 'when I saw our friend, Zadok Bar-Shemuel, with his legions of devils, meeting us at the shore, I could not help thinking that those dæmons had something to do with that storm.' Here it was my turn to speak, and I begged Jacob to relate to me the story. Jacob at once replied, 'Our friend shall hear it from the lips of Zadok himself; for we are all crossing the lake at his invitation to dine with him to-day.' Here Jehoiada put the very pertinent question, Did ye think ye could perish with Jesus in the ship? 'Nay, verily!' replied John, 'and we also forgot that he had said unto us, Let us go over unto the other side of the lake.' 'Nay,' said old Jonas, 'I was not with you on that occasion; but I was thinking of that other storm, when we had left Jesus on shore, and were caught in the midst of the sea.' 'Oh, yes!' said Andrew, 'when he came to us, walking on the water, and when he seemed to be passing us by?' 'And,' said Jacob, 'we thought it had been a spirit, and cried out the more.' 'Then,' said John, 'we distinctly heard his voice, amid the slight lull of the storm, It is I; be not afraid!' Then said Levi to me, 'Our friend Simon ventured forth

Digitized by Google

upon the boisterous waves to go to the Lord.' 'True,' interposed the honest Simon, who had just heard us, 'but oh! how soon I began to sink.' 'And,' said the loving John, 'how gently did he chide us *all* for our lack of trust in him:' then said he, turning to me, 'Not only did the storm cease, but there was at once a crystal sea, like unto this, instead of that gradual assuaging of the waves, which follows storms in the course of nature.' 'Ay,' said the old helmsman, 'but the great marvel to me was, that as soon as Jesus ascended upon this deck, and the storm ceased, we were in the twinkling of an eye, at the place whither we were bound.' 'What a very long time,' said Andrew, 'were the other vessels that were close to us in the storm, before they reached the haven.' Then interposed Leonatus, 'Never shall we at the fort forget that night; terrible was the hurricane! but instantaneous was the hush of the storm!' Then spoke our friend Jehoiada, citing from his sacred writings, which he has *ad unguem*, as we say in Rome.

"They that go down to the sea in ships;
That do business in great waters;
These see the doings of Jehovah;
These see his wonders in the deep;
He commandeth, he arouseth the storm-wind;
Which reareth up the waves of the sea.
They mount up to the skies;
They go down to the deeps;
Because of trouble the soul is melted;
They reel to and fro; as the drunkard they stagger.
They are even at their wits' end.
In their woe they cry unto Jehovah;
He bringeth them out of their distresses;
He maketh the storm a calm;
So that tranquil are the waves.
Then are they glad, because they be quiet;
So he bringeth them to their desired haven."

Then the whole of our joyous company joined in the beautiful notes of the chorus:

"O that men would praise Jehovah for his goodness,
For his wonderful doings for the children of men."

Scarcely had the deep bass notes of these fishermen died away, when we descried three men upon a point of land, and waving their welcome of us. These we soon discovered to be our two friends, Philip of Bethsaida, on this side of the lake, and Bartholomew his friend, *my friend*; I do love this man; an Israelite indeed in whom there is no guile: the third was our host, Zadok Bar-Shemuel. As we walked up the circuitous path, that winds up the steep cliff, and which leads to the village of Gergesa, Bartholomew and I conversed together about the Shiloh. He told me that on one memorable day he was in prayer under the figtree's dense shade, that there where there was no eye to scrutinise, and no mortal nigh to listen, he poured out his soul in an ecstasy of prayer, that he realised what the patriarch Jacob must have felt when at Peniel, he saw God face to face and his life was preserved. Soon after his dear friend Philip introduced him to Jesus, and that the Shiloh said unto him, "It was I that talked with thee under the figtree." 'How could I withhold my surprise, my delight, my trust in him. I exclaimed, Rabbi! thou art the Son of God!

Digitized by Google

thou art the king of Israel.' We soon reached the hospitable home of our host, most royal was our welcome, sumptuous was our entertainment, and our appetites had been whetted by the keen air upon the lake. After dinner, of which according to custom, Leonatus and I partook at a separate table, Jehoiada seated me between Zadok and himself, when the former related this tale of marvel. "I was once the terror of all this land, my deeds of violence have been without a parallel!" I instinctively shrank from him as from some foul murderer, with blood upon his accursed soul! I looked at him with a sidelong glance, but he was like anything, like everything but a savage brutal murderer. He looked at me with a look of love, such as I have never seen but on thy loving face, my fondest mother. "Yes, I was bound with chains, loaded with irons!" What! can this sumptuous furniture, this princely banquet, be the result of thy ill-gotten gains! "Not many months ago," he resumed, "I roamed naked, outcast, forlorn, my chief home was amongst the tombs, which cavern the cliff along which you sailed to-day; there I used to howl out my execrations of blasphemies to the roaring dashing waves. I delighted in the storm, it was music to my soul. I rejoiced to see the wrecked craft cast, by the merciless breakers, against these rugged cliffs; and especially did I revel in the shrieks of the despairing, struggling, with the wild billows." Thus he went on, accumulating horrors upon horrors, at length he exclaimed, "I was captain of a cohort of dæmons of evil, they garrisoned my soul; but there came to this coast the Captain of the hosts of Jehovah. He commanded these foul spirits of evil, and they rushed forth, entered into a herd of swine, which had been kept on a neighbouring farm, contraband of the law of the country, as well as of the law of Jehovah, when these articles of an illicit trade ran with a dœmoniacal fury down the precipitous cliff, and perished." "Yes," said Jehoiada, "our friend, Zadok, is indeed a most marvellous trophy of Jesus, who shall thus spoil principalities and powers." I was speechless with surprise, for our host is certainly one of the most lovable of human kind, most accomplished, most refined, most gentle, most winsome, one such as you only meet with once or twice in a lifetime; but of these, and such as these, I am acquiring many friends in this loved land. Oh, what an apostle for Jesus would not Zadok be! but Jehoiada assures me that Jesus has preferred that he should remain at home. He would not have it thought that he wrought his works of mercy to recruit his band of apostles. Truly this is another instance in which the Shiloh passed by the wise, the accomplished, the learned, and the wealthy, that he may be glorified rather by the simple, the poor, the unlettered, the unlikely of this present world.

It was the full of the moon, and much did we enjoy the return voyage to Capernaum, over the crystal lake, begemmed with heaven's reflected glories. I need not recapitulate our interchange of thoughts. But this day's enjoyment has gained for me two choice friends, Zadok Bar-Shemeul, and John Ben-Zebedee. Read this to whomsoever it pleases you. Greet my friends as if by name.

A. U. C. 786. VIII. *Id. Feb.*

Digitized by Google

NATURAL IMMORTALITY.

DEAR SIR,

Entirely agreeing with your opinion, as expressed on the cover of the July number of the *Rainbow*, that it is inexpedient indefinitely to prolong the discussion on this subject, and the closely related one of the final destiny of the lost, I feel some reluctance to return to it. At the same time, however, it is not, I apprehend, for the interests of truth that the skilfully constructed objections of Mr. Jukes against my doctrine should remain unnoticed; I therefore beg your kind insertion of the following brief remarks.

That Mr. Jukes and myself should differ as widely as we do on this and many other subjects can scarcely be wondered at, when we take into account the fact that *we interpret Scripture on very different principles.* Mr. Jukes is a subtle *Mystic;* I am, and trust ever to remain, a simple *Literalist.* Judging not only from his letter in the *Rainbow,* but also from other writings, it seems to me that *his* rule is never to accept Scripture in its natural and literal sense, if it be possible to put upon it one more recondite. With *me,* on the contrary, the rule is never to depart from the natural and literal sense unless absolutely compelled to do so. Is it then strange that we should differ? But in dealing with Mr. Jukes' objections, I labour under the additional disadvantage of having to defend the weakest points in my theory which his keen eyes can detect, while I have little opportunity of retaliating. I am as it were in the open, while he lies in ambush. His criticism is only destructive, and we all know how much easier it is to break our neighbour's windows than to prevent our own being broken. Certainly, as far as his book, "The Second Death and the Restitution of All Things" is concerned, there has been a very fair amount of damage done; which, at least to my knowledge, has not been repaired.

To see, however, what I can do in the case of my own windows. Mr. Jukes wishes, in the first place, for 'a clear definition' of the terms, "*by nature*" and "*an immortal being.*" I will endeavour to oblige him. By the term, "by nature," then, I mean *as esssentially constituted at creation;* and by the term "an immortal being," I mean *a being who must exist for ever, or, who is incapable of death.* Mr. Jukes, indeed, asserts that these two latter definitions, "are clearly not the same." All that I can say is that the distinction between them certainly appears to me a distinction without a difference. But when he goes on to say, "a creature may exist for ever who is by no means incapable of dying," he substitutes quite another definition. Between "a being who *must* exist for ever," and "a being who *may* exist for ever," there is both a distinction and a difference. That God could sustain a mortal creature in unending existence, I neither have denied nor would for a moment deny; but *where has God said he will do so?* That in the case of even the most wicked of mankind, he will do so for the purpose of endlessly tormenting him is a most awful supposition. Yet if the Bible be true, and God does so sustain any human soul out of Christ,

Digitized by Google

it assuredly will be for that purpose. So far I quite agree with Mr. Strong. I have said, and now deliberately repeat the statement, that if it can once be proved to me that man is essentially immortal, or, I will add, that God has revealed his determination to sustain him, in his fallen state, in unending existence, I shall feel compelled at once to accept the doctrine of eternal torment as the plain teaching of the New Testament.

So far, however, from God having intimated anything of the kind, he has, on the contrary, distinctly declared that the existence of the lost shall be terminated for ever in the lake of fire, which is the second death, in which he will destroy both body and soul. But objects Mr. Jukes, 'death is not annihilation.' Who ever said it was? Who cares a straw whether it is or not? When an animal dies is it annihilated? No; but *as an animal* it ceases to exist. When man's body dies is it annihilated? No; but *as a body* it very soon ceases to exist. When man's whole being shall become the subject of the second death, will it be annihilated? Perhaps not; but *as a living, conscious, intelligent person*, he will cease to exist. What more does it concern us to know? To bring in 'annihilation' is a poor unworthy quibble. Yes, 'death' in its dread consummation 'is non-existence.' I do not shrink from the definition; Mr. Jukes' spiritualising has not shaken my conviction in the least. For what is his definition of death? It is "only dissolution or separation; a separation from the world which until that death the spirit has lived in." But how will this apply to the death of animals, from which doubtless, as I showed in my reply to Mr. Strong, man's original idea of death was derived; was that only a separation from the world in which they had previously lived? Or how does it apply to the death of man's body? Is that "*only* a separation?" Is it not also a dissolution and destruction? Does it not cease to exist? But, objects my opponent, "Was Adam's death, in the day he sinned, annihilation?" I answer, Adam did not die *on the day he sinned*. All that is really implied in the threatening, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die," is, that from the day in which he sinned, Adam was *judicially and virtually* dead. His life—all the life he had—was forfeit. He was henceforth under sentence of death—the subject, the heir, the son of death. But again, "When Adam's spirit died to God, was it annihilated?" I answer again, his spirit did not in the true and proper sense *die*. "Is our death in trespasses and sins annihilation?" I answer once more, when the apostle Paul speaks of the unrenewed man as "*dead* in trespasses and sins" (Eph. ii. 1), he speaks metaphorically; but such a metaphorical use of language by no means implies that it has no real and literal meaning. Even so we ourselves speak of a religious recluse as '*dead* to the world;' or a shameless wretch as '*dead* to all sense of shame,' without at all confounding this with the literal sense in which it speaks of 'a *dead* man,' or 'a *dead* animal.' As I said in my reply to Mr. Strong, 'the literal fact is ever the substance of which the metaphor is the projected shadow.'

But I pass on to notice what Mr. Jukes evidently regards as the trap in which he has fairly caught me. If, as I stated in answer to Mr. Strong, 'Man dies by a double death, the first affecting only the body, but the second involving the extinction of the entire being,' Mr. Jukes enquires if I "mean that the first death is that which takes place when the body dies?" He will admit that at least I do not attempt to evade the legitimate consequence of my statement when I answer—*Yes!* For now comes

Digitized by Google

the difficulty. 'Do I then really, overlook man's awful spiritual death?' "If I rightly understand Mr. Maude's definition of Adam's death, the spiritual death in which we are through sin is no part of it; for '*the first death*,' he says, '*affects only the body; the second death involves the extinction of the entire being.*' Where, then, does he place man's spiritual death? Under which of his divisions can he put it? Is it part of the first or of the second death? It cannot be of the first, for '*the first*,' he says, '*affects only the body.*' Nor can it be a part of the second, for '*the second death involves the extinction of the entire being.*'" This objection is very ingenious; yet I must point out one little inaccuracy in Mr. Jukes' quotation of my words, which inaccuracy, slight as it may appear, affords as I apprehend the key to unlock the difficulty suggested. Mr. Jukes says, "Here are his words: 'The death which Adam actually incurred was death in the proper and ordinary acceptation of the word,'" &c. No, I beg pardon; here are my words: "The death which Adam *was threatened with in case of disobedience*, and which he actually incurred, was death in the proper and ordinary acceptation of the word.' The words I have italicised, though twice repeated, Mr. Jukes has omitted! Now, while I fully admit and believe much of what is ordinarily included under the term 'spiritual death,' *i.e.*, separation from God, the loss of such original righteousness as Adam possessed, and the darkening and paralysing of that highest element of man's nature, *the spirit*, which certainly existed in him, though only in a rudimental and germinal state; I nevertheless deny that *this* formed any part of *the death with which Adam was threatened in case of disobedience*. And I do so on this twofold ground. (1.) That we find the sentence of death pronounced on man as a fallen, and not as an unfallen being; that is to say, after he had eaten of the forbidden tree, and consequently when he was already in a state of 'spiritual death.' The terms of the sentence, "dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return" (Gen. iii. 19), being just the divine explanation of the original threatening, "dying, thou shalt die" (Gen. ii. 17.) (2.) Because as 'spiritual death' is confessedly a perpetuated condition of sinfulness, a death in trespasses and sins, if this was not the inevitable consequences of the fall, but a punishment inflicted by God, which might not otherwise have followed, it will appear that God actually punished sin with sin, and is therefore, in a certain awful sense, the author of the sin of all Adam's descendants who are born in this state of 'spiritual death.' I may add, that Adam being, even before the fall, a 'soulish,' in contradistinction to a 'spiritual' being, 'of the earth earthy,' as the apostle plainly teaches us in 1 Cor. xv., it is not to be supposed that he could have comprehended such an idea as that of 'spiritual death,' had it formed any part of the original threatening. Strangely but delusively bright are the colours in which theologians have painted the spiritual condition and dignity of the unfallen Adam; the fact is, however, that he was great in the undeveloped possibilities of his nature rather than in aught besides, and that we must after all regard him as but the frail clay image of a divine archetype to come.

And now, I think, it is my turn to suggest a little difficulty. Mr. Jukes holds that man is the subject of *many* deaths; even a Christian "is capable of dying several deaths." Yet, both in his book and in this letter, he lays much stress and attaches no little importance to the "second death," of which mention is made in the book of Revelation. Mr. Jukes,

Digitized by Google

moreover, admits that this is the *last* death of which any mention is made in Scripture—all the other deaths, whatever their number, must have preceded it. I ask, then, in relation to which of these preceding deaths is it denominated '*the second*?' for plainly it cannot be in relation to all of them. Mr. Jukes has answered this question: "The second death, if I err not, is the second death the spirit dies, its first death being to God; its second death being to God's opposite, sin." But how can this be, since the death of the body, at all events, intervenes between them? Does he really overlook man's literal bodily death, the death which is beyond all question included in the words, "dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return?" I unhesitatingly assert, on the contrary, that 'the second death' is so denominated *in relation to the death of the body*, and I base this assertion on the significant fact that in the twentieth chapter of Revelation exemption from the power of this death is declared to be the distinguishing privilege of those who have part in the first resurrection—which assuredly is a bodily resurrection—at the coming of the Lord. How strange and incongruous would it be to say that the partakers in a certain *bodily* resurrection of the "blessed and holy" shall thereby be exempted from a second *spiritual* death, and a death moreover which, according to Mr. Jukes, is not God's final judgment, but his unspeakable blessing. A death through which alone we can enter into the kingdom of heaven. Surely, to say that on those who have part in the first resurrection *this* 'second death' hath no power, would be equivalent to saying that they alone shall be lost. A strange promise this to the "blessed* and holy!" But, on the other hand, how congruous and in perfect harmony is it to say that those who have part in a first resurrection, the distinguishing characteristics of which are *incorruption* and *immortality* (1 Cor. xv. 51—54), shall thereby be placed for ever beyond the reach of a second death, which consists in the utter destruction of both body and soul in Gehenna.

But I must, in brief conclusion, notice the evidences of man's natural immortality, which Mr. Jukes has endeavoured to adduce from holy Scripture. They are two in number.

(1.) "*Adam was the son of God*" (Luke iv. 38); and "it is this divine parentage which makes man what he is, a spirit, which though fallen has an eternal destiny; a being who is eternal, because he is a son of God." Mr. Jukes here attempts to erect a vast superstructure upon a very insecure foundation. The argument which is based on this passage is thus conclusively disposed of by Dr. Candlish: "This mere rounding off of the genealogy of our Lord, as traced by Luke upwards, and not, as in Matthew's gospel, downwards—this simple intimation, that in Adam the ascending line of human parentage is lost, and that his origin must be ascribed immediately to God—is often brought forward as if it were not only an express, but even an emphatic assertion of Adam's proper

* Bengel says, "The word μακάριος is with great propriety applied to him over whom the second *death* has no power: for it is derived from ἦμι, κῆρ, so that it denotes one who is *immortal*." Mr. Jukes' criticism on Rev. ii. 6, and his assertion that the rigid interpretation of its language "evidently implies that such a soul, though conqueror, *has had to do with this death*," will but elicit a smile from the *unbiassed* critic. The unlearned reader may rest satisfied that the rendering of the English version expresses the sense of the original with sufficient accuracy.

Digitized by Google

personal sonship. . . . . In reality, there is no idea suggested in this whole pedigree or family-tree, but that of descent; son descending from father, until Adam is reached, whose descent is from no human father, but must be said to be of God. There is nothing like real fatherhood and sonship, as a permanent and personal relation asserted here.* Indeed the words rendered "which was the Son of God," inasmuch as the phrase is throughout elliptical (except in verse 23), might rather have been translated simply, "which was of God." Assuredly there is no proof of man's natural immortality to be found here.

(2.) But "*Adam was made in God's image*" (Gen. i. 26, 27). This is an old argument, but I had hoped well-nigh abandoned; for a moment's consideration suffices to expose its fallacy. The argument based on this passage must evidently be constructed thus: God is an immortal being; man is made in the image of God; *ergo*, man is an immortal being. But the fallacy of this will at once appear if we substitute some other divine attribute in the place of *immortality*. For instance: God is an omnipresent being; man is made in the image of God; *ergo*, man is omnipresent! And if it be objected that these conclusions do not equally follow, because while the first involves no absurdity, is in accordance with reason, and may be regarded as probably true, the second is palpably absurd, contrary to reason, and demonstrably false; I deny the force of this objection, and still maintain that the conclusions are equally just, because such an inference as that involved in the original argument can be fairly drawn only on the supposition of a complete resemblance. To illustrate this—If I say of two faces that they exhibit a perfect resemblance to each other, then I am quite warranted in fixing upon any particular feature in one face, and asserting that the other face must possess one precisely the same. But if, on the other hand, I am told that the two faces possess some one feature in common, and that feature is not specified, then I am not warranted in drawing any such conclusion. Now where, I demand, has Scripture declared that immortality is that special attribute of the divine nature in the image of which man was created? Certainly it is not in the text.

I find, from personal experience, that it is extremely difficult to convince those who have not investigated the matter for themselves, that there is really no intimation of man's natural immortality to be found in the Bible. It may, however, and I trust will, impel some to this conviction to find a man of Mr. Jukes' knowledge and ability forced to fall back upon such weak and worthless arguments as these. No; a divine capacity for immortality existed in Adam, and exists still in every human being, but it is as a seed which may dwindle for lack of nourishment, and die at last an undeveloped germ; but may, on the contrary, be developed and bring forth eternal fruit in Christ Jesus.

I am, dear sir,
Yours in Christ our Life,
W. Maude.

* On the Fatherhood of God, Lect. iii., p. 120.

Digitized by Google

Correspondence.

ADAM. TEMPLE SERVICES.

SIR,—I have somewhat to say concerning the contents of a paper of one of your contributors to the last number of "The Rainbow," and those of a letter of another. First, of the paper of Mr. Jukes, who I sadly fear has been wandering in a metyphysical maze, led by the spirit of a man rather than by the Spirit of God. He declares Scripture to assert that "Adam was the Son of God," and "made in his image;" yea, even now in "his image," which image he, by the context, evidently means the *moral* image of his Creator. I do not think that Scripture gives sanction to either the one statement or the other. First, as to Adam's being *the Son* of God. It will be observed that the words "*The Son*" in Luke iii. are of human origin, and a careful analysis of the chain would show that they should not have been inserted, for whilst most of the names are direct genealogical descendants, there are some not so. The list is given to prove that Jesus is the Son of Man *as such*; the promised "Seed of the woman," and Saviour. In Matthew a pedigree is given to prove that Jesus was a true Israelite from Abraham, and a royal personage, heir to the throne of David. Adam was no more "*the Son*" of God than Joseph was "*Son of*" Heli. The latter was in fact the son of Jacob through the line of Solomon (Matt. i. 16), and *son-in-law* of Heli; thus it should have been written, as in the original text, "Joseph who was *of Heli*," and thus, "Adam who was *of God*," though the latter "of" not from the same cause as the former.

The next point is a more serious one, and lies at the root of Mr. Jukes' fallacy. Adam was not made in the *moral* image of God any more than are his descendants, "men" who curse one another, and yet are said to be "*made after the similitude of God.*" (James iii. 9.) Adam was made after the form "of him that should come." (Rom. v. 14.) Redemption was in the counsels of God antecedent to creation. The latter was *in order o* the former. (Col. i. 15—17.) The Incarnation of the Son of God was "fore-ordained," the "*body*" *was* "*prepared*" in which redemption was to be accomplished. (1 Peter i. 19, 20; Heb. x. 5.) Adam was made in the "image" or "figure" of the coming Incarnate God; hence the Lord Jesus is termed "The last *Adam*," being Head of the new creation as the first was of the old. In form and circumstances only, though, was the first Adam the image, figure, or type of "the last." (See "The Last Adam," chap. iv.)

It is just as if a sculptor embodied an original subject formed in his mind, first in a model or image of clay, intending to produce its perfected resemblance in the finely chiselled and highly polished marble statue.

It was reserved for "the new man," which "*after God*, is created in righteousness and true holiness," to show forth the *moral* "Image of him that created him." (Ephes. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10, 11.) This expression of the life of God in man "renewed in knowledge," Adam had not; for the true "knowledge of good and evil" the divine life and energy are necessary.

A word in reference to Mr. Purdon's letter on the subject of the Millennial Israelitish Sacrifices declared by the prophet Ezekiel. Their necessity, object, and character will be best understood by a glance at the original mission of the ancient people of God. After the confusion of languages at Babel, and the scattering of the several nations in their condition of idolatrous darkness, the nation of Israel, having been instructed in the ways and acts of Jehovah, was so located, geographically, as to form a centre to the circumference of these ignorant heathen (Deut. xxxii. 8): the divine object being to turn them from the worship of idols to that of the One

Digitized by Google

True God. They sacrificed to devils, false Gods who could establish no title to the name, inasmuch as they could neither create nor bless. Hence Israel's mission was the proclamation of their God as the Creator, and the relationship in which the world stood to him as such. The very first words of their Scriptures supplied them with the most weighty truth for the cause they were entrusted with: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;" words that might have shone forth amidst the surrounding darkness—while the missionary nation could have pointed to the amazing fertility of their land and to its floral beauty, the plenteous store in their barns, and the prosperity of their families and flocks as evidences of the divine source from whence such blessings flowed.

Moreover, the character of the sacrifices, and the value of the Mosaic institutions—though they could not by the heathen, any more than by Israel, be understood in their spiritual meaning—could have been so far appreciated as being the appointment of their God, who was pleased visibly and tangibly to manifest his acceptance of them. (Let Deuteronomy, chap. xii. 1—12, be looked at.)

As a missionary nation, however, on their first occupation of their land, Israel signally failed. As men in flesh and blood, not knowing their own condition under the ban of the law, nor, as just said, the true nature of the very sacrifices they offered, were more ready to listen to the suggestions of Satan, who first blinded their minds and then led them to fraternise with the idolaters—the result we know.

But though Israel thus failed, the purpose of God has not. The resurrection millennial condition of the nation as "holy," and "a kingdom of priests," (Exod. xix. 5, 7), will produce fruit to the glory of God that the natural state could not.

Israel will once more be found in their land regenerated and restored, and in the same position geographically as before, in the midst of heathen nations who will not have heard of the fame of the Lord, Jehovah Jesus, nor seen his glory. (Isa. lxvi. 18, 19.) The wrath of God on a sin-defiled earth will have swept away the greater part of apostate Christendom, and Jesus the Son of God, King of Righteousness and Peace, Creator of the World and great High Priest, will occupy both the throne of Israel and of the universe *visibly*.

But this same Jesus will not cease to be testified of as "the Lamb of God" till "the residue of men," the complement of the redeemed family of God shall have turned to the Lord at his return. (See Acts xv. 15—18.) In order to this the sacrifices of Ezekiel's prophecy will be established—sacrifices in holy *contrast* with those of the idolatrous Gentiles; sacrifices that will be offered significantly pointing to *redemption accomplished*, and to the print of the nails in the hands of the King and Creator, who to this end will "*make bare his holy arm* in the eyes of all the nations, and all the ends of the earth *shall see* the salvation of Israel's God." (Isa. lii. 7—10.) Let Isaiah liv. 5, too, be carefully read, when the mighty power of Israel's testimony will be seen.

Add to this the Edenlike state of their land (Isa. li. 3), the magnificence of their renovated city—the world's metropolis (Psa. xlviii.)—the glory of the Temple of Ezekiel, and there will not be wanting effective agency for the accomplishment of the purposes of God, now in abeyance only.

Then will be brought to pass the following Scriptures:—Psa. xxii. 27—29; Isa. ii. 12—20; Rom. xv. 8—12.

Faithfully yours,

H. Goodwyn.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1869.

THE THREEFOLD REDEMPTION.

THE fall of man entailed on Adam and his posterity three direful consequences—the loss of the spirit, the death of the body, the forfeiture of the inheritance.

In the gracious and sovereign purpose of Almighty God, a threefold redemption was provided for the threefold evil. But how was God's love, mercy, and grace to accomplish this in consistency with his other attributes of holiness, justice, and truth? The righteousness of his laws must be vindicated by obedience, and the breach thereof must be punished.

All this has been done and accomplished for us by our blessed Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ, God manifest in the flesh, the God-Man, who wrought out in his humanity, through the agency of the Spirit, a holy and perfect obedience to the law, thereby fulfilling all righteousness, and voluntarily submitting to death for our sins, suffered the punishment due for our transgression; and by his resurrection in the same nature unto life, proved its acceptance with God as an all-sufficient atonement for the race whose nature he had adopted.

If sin abounded, grace has much more abounded, and the merits and death-blood of the second Adam are invaluable, and cover, and far more than cover, the sin and evil brought into the world by the fall and transgression of the first Adam. This wondrous Incarnation, and mysterious work of the all-wise God, the very angels look upon with amazement, while man, for whom it was wrought, too often views it with perfect indifference; and many learned philosophers, wise in their own conceit, with absolute unbelief, "but the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God," and in *its* wisdom the world knows not God.

It is not our object, however, to pursue this subject here in a general way, but to confine it more especially to that of the redemption of man's

Digitized by Google

inheritance—THE EARTH. All true Christians believe that the souls or spirits of the faithful shall hereafter be elevated to a higher degree of knowledge and bliss than they possessed before the fall; that in the resurrection they shall be re-united to bodies for ever freed from the penalty of death; whether premillenially, as in the case of the Bride, or ultimately after the general resurrection. But, unfortunately, by far the greater portion of even real Christians—keeping the great masses of mere professors or formalists entirely out of the question—stop short of the great truth, the restoration to man of his forfeited inheritance, constituting an essential portion of redemption work; while others, admitting that truth, consider the present earth, in its future millennial condition, to be the promised "new earth." Both we believe in error.

Satan, the destroyer, himself fallen from a higher state than man originally possessed, seduced our first parents into disobedience and sin. The sceptre of the world was committed into the hand of man on his creation, and he was commissioned to "have dominion over all the earth," and everything thereon was given unto him in possession. That dominion he lost, and the golden sceptre of love thus confided to him passed into the hands of Satan, the archfiend, who now sways it—a sceptre of iron—with mighty power, as the "Prince and God of this world;" and of this there can be no manner of doubt, for everything around us bespeaks the great truth, "that the world lieth in the wicked one;" and it will continue to do so until he comes whose right it is to take the crown.

Is Satan, then, to possess this power for ever; or will he be permitted to destroy for ever the inheritance which God expressly gave to man, as an everlasting possession; or is redemption incapable of accomplishing for it, what it effected for soul and body—its recovery? Assuredly not. But as man, on his resurrection, has his body changed (Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 56), yet still a body, so has he his inheritance changed, but it still continues to be a material reality.

But, in fact, the future creation of a "new earth," specially intended for man, is *explicitly* foretold and revealed in four passages of Scripture, two in the Old Testament, two in the New; besides being otherwise referred to, so that we are left in no reasonable doubt on the subject; if language is to be received in its plain and common-sense understanding. Unfortunately, however, when so apprehended, it does not fall in with our prevailing popular theological systems, and consequently it is to be got rid of, either by what is erroneously called *spiritualising*; or by what may be more convenient still, by ignoring it altogether, which is the easiest way of doing it.

"The times of RESTITUTION of all things" (Acts iii. 19, 20), commence with the *personal* and *pre*-millennial advent of our Lord, for which he has

Digitized by Google

emphatically commanded us to WATCH; but our theological schools have very generally ignored, or at least, set aside this very plain commandment for many centuries to come; teaching, in direct contradiction to our Saviour's warning, that the world must *first* be converted, and a millennium of some kind or other run its course, through the instrumentality of the churches of *this* dispensation, ere that great event can take place. But, verily, the present aspect of *nominal* christendom in general, heralds not the approach of any such flattering prospect. Divided into innumerable sects and parties, it holds forth no enticing example or pattern of holiness to the world at large. It is not celebrated for exhibiting "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," nor for Christian love and harmony; and, in fact, in everything around us, unsettled and disordered, we can only realise the *tokens* of the rapidly advancing "perilous times of the last days" of this dispensation, so clearly and repeatedly foretold in Scripture.

We are also warned to beware of "philosophy and science, *falsely* so called," making rapid *progress* in the world. Learned men walking in the sparks of their own kindling, and presumptuously deifying intellect, set aside the light of God, and throwing off mask and cloak, boldly stalk abroad unabashed in the ranks of infidelity, often countenanced by those who profess better things.

Far less will the happy days in store for the world be brought about by mere *political* or *social* changes, now so rife everywhere. Such expectations are vain and delusive in the extreme. The Bible; the history of man from first to last; and the disordered and unsettled aspect of all things, prove to the reflecting mind, guided by the word of God, that the boasted "*progress*," now proceeding with such rapid strides, tends altogether to an opposite direction, and will be fatally experienced when too late. Man having failed in every trial; the real moral and spiritual regeneration of the world, without which all is vanity and vexation of spirit, awaits the time when the Father of mercies "shall (again) send Jesus Christ," who "shall so come in like manner (visibly and personally) as ye have seen him go into heaven," and for which we are earnestly exhorted to "WATCH," lest, slumbering and sleeping, the door be shut, and we ourselves excluded. The Bridegroom having come; the wise virgins, ready and prepared, together with the resurrection saints, constituting the *Bride, complete* in every member, are delivered, and taken up to meet the Lord, and so be with him for ever.

We hope to be pardoned these preparatory observations, and now proceed to the more immediate subject of this paper.

I. The first of the four direct promises referred to, occurs in Isaiah lxv. 17: "For, behold, I *create* new heavens and a new earth; and the former (that now existing) shall not be remembered nor come into mind." This

Digitized by Google

is plain enough ; but a misconception has arisen as to the *relative* period of that creation, in consequence of circumstances narrated in the following verses of that chapter being considered by some as applicable to the new earth of the seventeenth verse. But that is not a necessary consequence ; and these detail themselves, and other portions of Scripture clearly indicate their inapplicability to the glorious and *final* inheritance of man, in so far as is revealed to us in the word of God. For example—the city of Jerusalem, however happy and blessed in the millennial age, shall not at all exist on the *new* earth. These verses speak of children, and old men, with staff in hand for very age (Zech. viii.), and to whatever length their days may be prolonged ; yet *death*, and even *worse* may occur, which are quite incompatible with the *resurrection* state of man, occupying a holy and heavenly inheritance, on which sin and death shall never enter, nor Satan ever set foot.

In the meantime, we may observe that the seventeenth verse conveys simply a general promise, or revelation, which God has been pleased to make unto man, relative to his future destiny ; and then turning specially to his chosen nation Israel, with reference to his *peculiar* covenant with them, when Jerusalem shall be "the joy of the whole earth," and the chosen place of his glorious manifestation in his coming millennial kingdom—the theme of all the prophets, he says : "But be YE glad, and rejoice for ever in that which I create ; for behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." Then follow the promises of longevity, not of *eternal* life, as on the new earth—fertility and fruitfulness ; immediate communication with the Lord, through the temple worship ; and the complete subjugation of the animal creation to man. These latter verses, therefore, refer to the millennial age, on Israel's future restoration, and must manifestly precede the new creation, to which they are inapplicable.

II. The second intimation we have of God's purpose to create a new earth for man on the destruction of the present, we find in the twenty-second verse of the last chapter of the same prophet, "For as the new heavens and the new earth which *I will make*, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so your shall *seed* and your *name* remain." In these words we find an explicit announcement that God's promises, in reference to his special covenant with his ancient and chosen people Israel, do not terminate with the existence of the earth we now inhabit. We possess, in the first place, ample proof in all the prophets, of their continuing as a distinct people during the millennial age ; and we are informed that some corresponding distinction shall continue to exist, on their transference to the new earth at the *end* of that age, for their *name and seed* shall be co-eval and co-eternal with it, and on that inheritance there shall be neither death nor curse—and here revelation ends.

Digitized by Google

III. We now come to that remarkable passage in the New Testament (2 Peter iii.), where it is written: "But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men . . . . . but the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night (unexpectedly); in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and all the works that are therein shall be burned up . . . . . looking for and hasting the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Nevertheless we, according to his promise (Isaiah), look for *new heavens and a new earth,* wherein dwelleth righteousness."

This language is clear and explicit, and no commentary could make it clearer. We are to look for the creation of a "new earth," as the inheritance of man in a future state. But when? In "the day of the Lord." Does that day embrace a period of twenty-four hours? No! For, "beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." In Scripture, the word *day* often implies a long period—an age, a dispensation, of which various proofs might be given were it necessary. "The DAY of the Lord," in fact, comprehends the whole of Christ's millennial reign, together with his body, the translated bride, and members of the *first* resurrection, who at the advent, descend with the Lord in judgment on the Antichrist and the *living* nations; and then commences his judicial reign and kingdom, as "the Son of Man," and as heir to David's throne (Luke i. 30—33), which peculiar reign terminates at the end of the thousand years, with the general resurrection and judgment giving place to another and still more glorious dominion, or that new world in which the work of redemption and *restitution* shall be completed. The apostle indeed does not say at what period of *that* day the substitution of a new creation in place of man's present habitation shall take place, but that point is easily determined from other Scriptures, and when the import of the word "day" is rightly understood in this and other passages, in connection with their respective contexts, as not being limited to twenty-four hours only, all difficulty vanishes, and the impossibility of its occurring at the commencement of that day appears to be clearly demonstrated.

There is abundant evidence besides, to prove that the millennial earth cannot be the "new earth," for we learn that during that age many places and things shall exist which are now in existence; such as the Red Sea, the Mediterranean Sea, the Dead Sea, the river Euphrates, the *earthly* Jerusalem, Egypt, and other cities and countries modified, no doubt, to a certain extent, by *physical* changes, conducive to the well-being of man,

Digitized by Google

and in harmony with the blessed reign of the King of kings, and Lord of lords. Destroying storms and tempests, ungenial and unfruitful seasons, malaria and pestilential diseases, &c., shall cease their devastating influences, except when sent as special acts of judgment on kingdoms or nations, guilty of acts of disobedience or rebellion, as declared for example in Isaiah lx. 12, and Zech. xiv. 16—19; when such shall be prompt and effectual.

Now, it is impossible, we say, that seas, rivers, cities, &c., *now* in existence, could continue on the millennial earth, supposing that earth to be the "new earth" of promise, inasmuch as we are distinctly told that "the heavens and earth which are now," shall be utterly consumed, and *every thing* thereon burned up by fire, the very elements melting with fervent heat, to give place to an entirely "new creation," but still an *earth*, as the promised inheritance of man. The words of St. Peter, if words have any meaning at all, clearly imply complete destruction of existing things, and consequently as we have seen, that cannot come *pre*-millennially.

The mistake in supposing *that* creation to be identical with the millennial earth, seems in a great measure, to have arisen from the circumstance of *fiery* judgments being frequently associated in Scripture in *immediate* connection with the personal advent of our Lord; but on a careful examination of all those passages, it will clearly appear that they are all limited and confined to local circumstances, as to man himself, as in the case of Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities of the plain, and in no case refer to the general conflagration of the elements; and, in proof of this, we may refer to two of the most remarkable passages in Scripture on that point—one in the Old Testament, Dan. vii. 9—14, and one in the New, 2 Thess. i. 7—10.

IV. We now arrive at the fourth and last passage of Scripture, in which the creation of *another earth* for man is distinctly and explicitly announced, and that is by the apostle John, in the twenty-first chapter of Revelation. That wonderful book, although entirely rejected by many of the "wise ones" of this world, and considered by too many Christians as an unsolvable enigma only to be understood by its accomplishment, nevertheless, as regards the first, contains within itself the most decided proofs of its divine origin; and as respects the second, the clearest REVELATION of coming events of the deepest importance to man, and God's future purposes towards the human race, notwithstanding the frequent occurrence of symbolical language, which may occasion some difficulty in minor details, without obscuring the great leading truths themselves. But, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear (understand or appreciate) the words of this prophecy, and *keep* those things which are written therein, for the time is at hand" (Rev. i. 3). And on the other hand, "If any man shall

Digitized by Google

take away from the words of the book of *this prophecy*, God shall take away his part from the book *(tree)* of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

The last four chapters of this book, which close the word of God, are deeply interesting, and demand the most prayerful attention. They contain a brief summary, not of myths, but of a number of the most remarkable events, yet clear and distinct in themselves, which, commencing with the period of the second advent, pass through the millennial age, and terminate with the creation of a "*new heaven and a new earth*," wherein dwelleth righteousness. Isaiah and Peter beheld them with the eye of prophecy, through a long vista of ages, as future truths; the apostle John is made to *see* them, in vision, as literal and accomplished facts.

In the twentieth chapter he says, "And *I saw* a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away"—the one just as literal and material as the other—but when? The preceding chapter informs us, at the period of the *general* resurrection and judgment, which all Christians allow to be a *post*-millennial event, for it is then, and not before, that "the earth and heaven flee away" (melt, dissolve, and disappear, as described by St. Peter) from the face of him that sat on the great white throne of judgment, "and there was found no place for them."

At that time "the sea gave up the dead which were in it," and St. John tells us, that on the new earth "there is *no more sea*," consequently it is utterly impossible that the new earth can exist prior to the general resurrection, and that must be *post*-millennial, seeing that previously thereto there are seas in existence, and graves also in abundance to give up their respective dead.

On that *new* creation, "there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the *former things are passed away*;" and then, the grand consummation of "the times of the *restitution of all things*" having culminated, it is announced, "Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write, for these words are *true* and *faithful*." "It is done." 'Tis a pity, a great pity, that human theories should for one instant be permitted to nullify truths so plainly and palpably material in character, as if the glorious orbs and worlds of the Almighty Creator, were only made to be extinguished, as incompatible with the highest spiritual condition of redeemed man in eternity. If such was true, Why a resurrection body? and if a resurrection body, Why not also a restored *material* inheritance? although both may be greatly superior to their previous condition of existence.

The apostle further declares, that he "saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven," when, "Behold the tabernacle of

Digitized by Google

God is with *men*, and he will *dwell* with them, and they shall be his *people*, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." Observe! Not, as in the millennial age, immediately *above*, but now actually ON the new earth itself, and thus, we believe, the great antitypical parallel will be completed. The Shekina glory first *dwelt* in the tabernacle of Moses, which was constructed according to the *pattern* shown to him by God in the mount. (Heb. viii. 5.) The type, secondly, shall be still more remarkably fulfilled in the millennial kingdom, when the paradise of God shall rest *above*, and in immediate connection with the temple of Ezekiel, and the earthly Jerusalem of restored Israel in the holy oblation beneath, as elsewhere referred to; and, thirdly, shall be finally realised in the new creation, when the holy city itself shall actually *rest* on man's inheritance, and "the Lord God and the Lamb are the temple of it," and "the *throne* of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads. And there shall be no night there."

Into that heavenly city, the church, honoured above all as "The Lamb's Wife," called "to meet the Lord in the air," entered a thousand years before; being the heirs and joint heirs with him to "the throne of his father David," and as *rulers* with him of the long promised kingdom. The bride is complete in every member at her assumption, a perfect bride, and to that special body, called to the highest dignity the creature can attain unto, nothing is wanting, and nothing remains to be added. Next, the twelve tribes of Israel, on their post-millennial translation to the new earth, seem to stand in immediate and peculiar connection with the glorious city itself—similar to the typical position they are previously destined to hold in the millennial age with respect to the earthly Jerusalem, the twelve gates of which are named after the twelve tribes; see Ezek. xlviii. So, in respect to the heavenly city, its twelve gates shall bear the names "of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel." Rev. xxi. 12, 13. Thirdly, during the millennial age, "all the nations which came against Jerusalem, even all the families of the earth, are required to go up unto Jerusalem, from year to year, to worship the King, the Lord of Hosts. (Zech. xiv. 16—19.) So here, after the general judgment and translation to the new earth, it is written, "The nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it (the New Jerusalem), and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it, for its gates shall never be shut, and the glory of God and the Lamb is the light thereof." (Rev. xxi. 22—27.) But "there shall in nowise enter into it anything that defileth."

And here it is impossible to overlook the distinction so decidedly marked in Scripture up to the very end of all, as existing between the church (the *real*, not the nominal), Israel, and the nations of the earth generally. This

Digitized by Google

is not accidental. It is pregnant with meaning like all God's purposes, and involves considerations of deep importance as connecting the past, present, and future.

Thus we trace the work of God in its manifold aspects throughout; man's spirit, body, and inheritance lost! Man's spirit, body, and inheritance redeemed through grace by the atoning blood of the Lamb of God "which taketh away the sin of the world." All these are subjects of wonder, praise, and adoration to angels, archangels, principalities and powers in heavenly places, however lightly esteemed by man himself, but sources of everlasting bliss and joy to the saved, whatever differences of degree or reward may exist in a future state, even "as one star differeth from another in glory."

Although this paper has much exceeded in length our intention and expectation, still, in conclusion and in direct connection with our subject, we feel strongly drawn to say a very few words respecting—

THE TREE OF LIFE, as bearing on the history of the human race from beginning to end, from Genesis to Revelation, and therefore demanding attention. Man, in consequence of disobedience, having, in mercy, been excluded from the garden of Eden, "lest he should put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and *live for ever*," would, for God has said it, have lived for ever, but in everlasting misery and alienation from his God and Creator. That tree is again restored to him, by grace, in the sovereign purpose and love of our heavenly Father. It is regained by the glorified Bride, on her being taken up to meet the Lord at the period of the second advent; for among other promises it is said, "to him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." (Rev. ii. 7.) And, finally, it will be restored to Israel; and also to the saved of the nations, to whom it was *previously* inaccessible, on their *translation* to the new earth, on which the heavenly city will then *descend;* when, and not before, the *leaves* of the tree are for the *healing* of the nations. (Rev. xxii. 2.)

In Ezekiel xlvii. we find the type of this in the trees which grow on the waters which flow from the temple during the millennial age, "the *fruit* thereof shall be for meat, and the *leaf* thereof for medicine (healing)," but it is important to remark that "the tree of life" is not among them.

The gift of eternal life to man is conferred, indeed, by the quickening and regenerating power of the Holy Spirit, through the redemption work of Christ Jesus, whose precious blood cleanseth from all sin; but the *outward* token, seal, or pledge, of the certainty of that gift to the creature man, is the restitution of that tree which he lost by disregard to the command and warning of God. If the tree of life in the paradise of Eden was a reality and no fable, so we here find the same tree, restored in the paradise of God, a reality and no fable.

Digitized by Google

The almighty and all-wise Being may attach such consequences or indications, in his visible and material creation, to outward signs as seemeth unto him good, in proof that all sovereign power, incomprehensible, in the acts themselves, by the limited faculties of the creature, emanate from the great Creator of all. Thus, when Moses stretched out his rod, the Red Sea was *divided,* and stood up as a wall of brass on either hand, but it was not the rod that did it; it was only the sign. When our Lord anointed the eyes of the blind man with clay, he saw, but it was not the clay that did it; it was only the sign. But having noticed this subject, in connection with other important matters elsewhere, we cannot here enlarge.*

In the meantime, our more immediate call, in anticipation of the new earth, and its glorious surrounding new heavens (of the happiness, constitution, bliss, and various aspects and unending enjoyments of which we can have no possible conception), is to look and long for the *commencement* of the "TIMES OF RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS, at the second advent of our blessed Lord; for verily until "the Prince of Peace" cometh there will be no peace on earth, but perplexity, tribulation, and distress of nations. And in conclusion, as our Lord says, "Surely I come quickly," may we join in prayer, with the last words of the Bible, "Amen, even so, come, Lord Jesus;" and in obedience to his warning voice, may we, for that great event, earnestly "WATCH."

GEO. OGILVY.

CONFESSION OF THE KING.

A GREAT number of Englishmen—dukes, earls, barons, merchants, mechanics, and peasants—were at one time out of harmony with the existing rule, and looking for another monarch in whose divine right they believed most devoutly.

Their position was false and dangerous, the claims of their saintly hero to the throne were very questionable, and the grace and glory with which they invested him purely imaginary. But still the worship was profound, and the aspiration fervent; they nourished an intense though an unholy and devouring fire, by speaking to each other of the grand time, when *the king would have his own again.*

We have a better standing, a loftier hope, which nourishes a finer fire and a nobler enthusiasm; for the King, whose presence we desire, has in his person and character all the elements and attributes which are beautiful or sublime, which are saintly, heroic, or Godlike. The righteousness of his

* The Day of the Lord, &c." 1860. Nisbet & Co., London.

Digitized by Google

claim to the throne is beyond controversy, and the power in reserve for enforcing such claim beyond all limits.

The present visible kingdom is the kingdom of darkness, where the god of this world bears rule. Men do not perceive this, because there is a *veil* spread over *all nations*. It is, however, the dread and sober certainty; the purple, gold, and fine linen, the diplomacy, war and commerce, the art, science, and philosophy, the power, majesty, and glory, are all at present of the world, and of that evil spirit, who rules for a season its destinies.

But "there is another King, one Jesus," supposed by some to be dead in a "lone Syrian town," affirmed by others to be alive, yea, Prince of Life, righteous claimant of David's throne, and true Lord of all thrones, forces, and dominions. We are among those who believe in the ringing words which peal so clear, so audible, so solemn, and so inspiring, through the halls of time, and the abysses of eternity, "Fear not; I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, amen; and have the keys of hell and of death."

A rapid glance at a few of the passages in which the King was confessed, may occupy us profitably for a season. "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judæa, in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him." (Matt. ii. 1, 2.) The wise men were Gentiles. Their insight and their journey growing out of it indicated that the King whom they came to reverence, though born King of the Jews, would have a dominion wider than Palestine, and gather under the wings of his regality princes and subjects with other blood than Hebrew. We get a glimpse of the comprehensiveness of the salvation provided, and the breadth of the descending empire, and the glory of the golden gates of the true holy city, beginning to shine forth. While the entranced shepherds, amid celestial radiance and song, receive with gladness the new-born King—on the Jewish side—the wise men receive him as representatives of Gentilism. We see the walls of partition falling down, and a new temple rising where men of all races and languages may worship with one consent the Ancient of days, and the Father of all spirits.

The wise men were astrologers. The knowledge of the period, though wonderfully various, and far more inspiring than the present, had not assumed methodic or scientific shape. It cannot, however, be reasonably questioned, that the prevalent faith of that time, that all fields of information had connections with the mystical and the spiritual, gave grace and glory, charm and rapture, to the study of plants or stars, which we miss in modern days.

Digitized by Google

While the magi were busy in their sublime work of midnight meditation, travelling on wings of wonder and esctacy among countless worlds of light, there shines forth a NEW LUMINARY. The calculations of Ideler and Kepler render it probable that in connection with the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, a new star was actually visible to observing eyes, about the time of our Lord's birth.

But it matters little. We could perhaps as easily prove that there was a natural eclipse when our Lord was crucified. It seems to me we are in a region where Kepler and Newton have no more light than the rest of us, unless the insight of the spirit be deeper. The new star belongs to spiritual astronomy. Whether it burn out, or shine in some higher heavens, or whither it may be wandering, we cannot tell. The star is gone, but the Lord remains, in undiminished brightness. He is Lord of all the stars; all things were made by him, all things were made for him, and in him all things consist, or stand together.

After our Lord had fed the Jewish people by miracle, which revealed creative power, they wanted to take him by force and *make* him a king. But he departed and hid himself. He would not be *made* a king; he was *born* one. "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" It is easy to clothe a person with Tyrian purple, to give him a throne of gold blazing with precious stones, to blow trumpets before him in solemn and imposing procession. But it is no easy matter to find royalty in the spirit. In the last bad days of the Roman empire, the throne was several times sold to the highest bidder by the degenerate prætorian guards; but the wretches who bought the name were never kings, for they could buy no inward glory, and there was no regnancy of soul to shine forth in outward majesty.

Strauss, and others among the devil's advocates, have urged that it was wrong to enlist fiction in the cause of truth, to make astrology subservient to Christianity. This is passing strange. Whatever would become of the world, if all its moral scenery and circumstances were not continually made subservient to something higher? The birds of prey consume the carrion, the scavengers remove the uncleanness. Sennacherib may blaspheme, and Pilate sneer, and Julian fling dust in the air, but all are in some way labourers for God. The most tremendous crime of Jerusalem and its rulers opens a fountain of life, and the saintly blood of martyrs running in rivers nourishes the church.

It seems to be one of the laws of human nature, that love shall be testified by gifts. The law has operated in all ages, in all places, and among all the races of mankind. Each true man can speak of some dear one for whom, or to whom, he would give his heart and his life. If power were equal to good-will, whither would we not wander to find things rare and costly for the beloved one? The secret treasures of the deep, the

Digitized by Google

shells and jewels from Indian shores, the silk in purple of Tyre, the gold and rubies from the mine, would all be gathered and laid down in secret joy at the feet of the beloved one. The same powerful love, with like spontaneity, works in the higher and deeper region, and the magians were under its inspiring potency. It was equally made manifest in the journey and the offering. Owing to the immense distance, and the nature of the roads in the remote east, such a pilgrimage was no slight matter. It has been considered probable that they began their journey about the time of the conception of our Lord, and only arrived at Bethlehem to find the young child lying by his mother. But no distance, or danger in the path, or weariness of the flesh, could daunt the eastern travellers. It was not scientific ardour, or political interest. Victorious love was there, and so they gather the richest things which their country could produce, and resolutely travel on laden with their treasures; for the service is one of love, profound and absorbing, and all labour is sweetened on the road, and rewarded at the end with fulness of content.

We need not be discouraged if we have no frankincense or gold, or anything very costly or glorious, to bring into the service of the Lord. The poorest can bring their whole nature, body, soul, and spirit, and what richer offering can be presented? Only let us feel, whatever our circumstances may be, that all we are, and all we have, are his. Give him freely in love, being, property, and time, and receive his fulness in return.

The offering of the wise men was homage rendered to a king. Such homage was customary among the people of the earth when they drew near to a sovereign power, and so the magians testified their allegiance to a monarch high above all the kings and princes of the earth. It was predicted, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." The wise men knew that he was born King of the Jews, and he himself, when he witnessed his good confession before Pontius Pilate, acknowledged that such monarchy was his. It is indeed true, and precious truth, that the rule of Christ begins in the inward man; he lays the deep foundations of his sublime kingdom in willing, human souls; but it is equally true, that his empire would be wanting in one essential point, if it failed in subordinating to itself the external world, and becoming finally realised in the glory of perfect transfiguration and visible dominion.

It is quite possible that there was more in the nature of the offering than the worshippers were able to perceive. The informing and guiding Spirit of God was in the matter from first to last. In the composition of the holy anointing oil, pure myrrh was the principle ingredient. With that holy oil, the tabernacle, the ark of the testimony, the table and all the

Digitized by Google

vessels, the altar, the laver, the priest, and all his helpers, were to be anointed, that all might be sanctified as most holy. Frankincense, pure, was the chief ingredient in that confection, which was beaten into ashes or powder, and which, from the altar of incense, rose up in clouds morning and evening, as prayer and worship would arise on prevailing wings, in a nobler dispensation. As to gold, we find that almost everything about the mercy-seat was made of pure gold. "And he made the mercy-seat of pure gold;" "and he made two cherubims of gold, beaten out of one piece, made he them, on the two ends of the mercy-seat. These golden cherubim spread out their wings on high and covered over the mercy-seat, with their faces one toward another, and both gazing down toward the mercy-seat." (Exodus xxxvii.) The church in Laodicea is counselled to buy of the Lord pure gold, tried by fire, that she may have the true riches. The streets of the Holy City is to be pure gold. It seems from these and kindred passages that gold, in the natural world, symbolizes *truth* in the spiritual. All the glorious work of pure gold in the ancient time anticipated Him who was truth absolute and truth essential, and to hold fast the truth as it is in Jesus is the crowning glory of man.

If, then, we consider gold as symbolising *truth*, frankincense as representing *worship*, and myrrh as setting forth *holiness*, we catch the living spirit of the transaction. The magians were led by the Spirit of God to present an acceptable and significant offering before the Great King. Into a world where the murderer of human souls was deceiving by his corrupting lies the Great One had come, who was himself *truth*—divine, perfect, unchangeable; who would give himself as the food of famishing humanity, that the new life might ascend on triumphal wings of *worship* to the throne of God, and flow out in the beauty of *holiness* before men.

We have another remarkable confession of the King on record in the first chapter of John. "Jesus saw Nathaniel coming to him, and saith of him, Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile. Nathaniel saith unto him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Phillip called thee, when thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee. Nathaniel answered and said unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel!" In reply to this explicit and solemn confession, the promise is made by the Lord, "Verily, verily I say unto you, hereafter, ye shall see heaven open and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." The men of *guile* in the midst of opulent revelation of power and goodness were inclined to give Satan the honour, though a little more thought and a little less wickedness, would have shown them that the Anarch, the spirit of evil, would surely not shake his own kingdom, and cast out his own retainers. But the man without *guile* has eyes for the signet ring of the King—for the sign manual

Digitized by Google

of the Lord—a scintillation of evidence is sufficient to flash conviction into his open heart. "Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel." We are irresistibly led back to the memorable vision of the patriarch Jacob. He lighted on a certain place and tarried there all night, because the sun was set, and took the stones of that place for pillows, and lay down to sleep. "And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven, and behold the angels of God, ascending and descending on it." (Gen. xxviii.) After the patriarch awoke he exclaimed reverentially, "Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not." "How dreadful is this place, this is none other than the house of God, and this the gate of heaven." We are better pleased now with pillows of down or feathers, but some of us would be willing to try the stones, if in compensation we could have visions so glorious. It was quite time for Jacob to learn that God was in *all* places, and that the connection between heaven and earth was certain and well established. Man in league with the evil spirit had done his utmost to destroy such connexion, but God in the promise of the life-restorer had reserved the earth unto mercy. But we reach the true Jacob's ladder when we come to the Life indeed made manifest in visible glory. As Son of God he touches heaven, which is his native place, for he was in glory with the Father before the worlds were; as King of Israel he touched the earth which will be his territory when he *cometh to reign*. Then and not till then shall we see the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man. He is the one who substantially unites heaven and earth with golden chains, and brings the divine and the human into rich and indissoluble union.

As the chestnut tree is wrapped up in the nut, or the oak tree in the acorn, so all offices were wrapped up in our Lord when on earth. A man might say with the nut in his hand, potentially this is a magnificent chestnut tree, but it wants development by contact with sun and soil, and all the auxilliary ordinances of nature. In regard to Jesus, the Anointed, or Christed, there were comprehended the prophetic, the priestly, and the kingly functions to be successively developed. It is true, an objector might say, was there not royalty revealed in the stupendous works of the Lord, in the very splendour of power, and in the perfectness of beneficence? And was his sacrifice not at least a priestly work, and even the intercessory prayer, in which he held up the apostles, and in them, all Christian humanity before the throne of God? All this may be granted, and yet it remains in substance true, that the offices were to have successive development, to be unfolded in fine stages. He was revealed as a Prophet or Teacher in Judæa, and his great works were mainly to show forth his authority to expound. He could not have been a Priest had he remained on the earth, for there were priests who offered sacrifice according to the

Digitized by Google

law. He has had development as a Priest at God's right hand by the golden altar, pleading the value of his own most precious blood.

He will be revealed as a King, when he bows the heavens and comes down, when we see him as he is, with his eyes like lamps of fire, and many crowns on his head. There is a blessed and only Potentate, King of kings, and Lord of lords, and the time comes for the revelation of his august power and his eternal glory.

Oh, how we yearn and long for the brightness of his appearing! "For our life is hid with Christ in God; and when he who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory."

Come, Lord, for darkness gathers round us, which like that of Egypt may be felt. The supreme leaders of human thought are all drifting into godless regions, where there is neither light nor life. The Church visible has no sublime unity, but is a discordant rabble of warring sects, not much above the world in either faith or holiness.

Anointed and holy One! descend in thy chariot of light and power, revealing that kingdom for which we continually pray.

G. GREENWELL.

THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS.*

BEYOND all question we have taught to us in Holy Scripture the doctrines of a fall from good to evil, and of a restoration from evil to good. God's world is first represented to us as "very good" at its creation, as subsequently overshadowed by the dark cloud of moral evil; as destined once more to shine in even greater purity and glory than at its beginning. This restitution is represented to us as *a complete one*. There is no imperfection in its conception; there is no failure in its execution. It was planned by God, and will be brought to pass by him, and is in all respects worthy of infinite wisdom, untainted justice, endless mercy, and unbounded power. It has never been kept a secret by him. All whom he ever sent in his name to declare his purposes to the fallen race, have testified of it. Plainly, repeatedly, prominently, has it been revealed. God has spoken of this "restitution of all things" by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began (Acts iii. 21).

A very great difficulty is and has long been felt with regard to this restitution. This difficulty connects itself with the question, *how* this restitution is to be effected, so that it shall at once be as complete and full

* "The Second Death and the Restitution of all Things." By Andrew Jukes, M.A. Second Edition. London: Longmans, 1869. "Doctrine of Annihilation:" *Rainbow*, July, 1869.

Digitized by Google

as it is represented to us in God's word, and at the same time in agreement with all the other declarations of that word. No solution that either impairs the completeness of the restitution, or contradicts any other doctrine of the Bible can be received as satisfactory by anyone who accepts Holy Scripture as being all of it God's word.

One great theory, which we call that of Augustine, and which has been very generally accepted in the church, would solve the difficulty thus. It teaches that a great many of the fallen race of men are from time to time redeemed from sin and its curse; that at a coming time this redemption shall be far more extensive; that a period will eventually arrive when there shall be no moral evil whatsoever *upon this earth;* that then all things *here* will once more be very good; and that in this glorious consummation will be fulfilled the long-promised restitution.

There is no doubt that all this is true, but it is yet *no solution* of the question. A restitution *of all things* is not answered by any restitution however glorious *of some.* It is not true that all is once more very good, while any portion of God's creatures are in rebellion against his will. Hell, wherever it be, or whatever it be, is as much a part of God's world, as earth or heaven; and all would not be very good in God's world, if there were in any part of it, however remote, such a hell as Augustine has pictured, a fearful place filled with its teeming myriads of fallen spirits and men throughout eternity blaspheming the God of the whole universe. It is not our purpose here to controvert this theory. We have already in a pamphlet, *to which as yet we have seen no reply,* shown the insufficient grounds on which it is rested.*

There is another theory, inseparably connected with the name of its first known teacher, Origen of Alexandria, which would solve the difficulty thus. It supposes the restitution of all things to consist in restoring *every individual* of the fallen race to the image of God and to eternal holiness and joy. In some, this restoration is mainly effected in this present life, and will be consummated at the period called in Scripture "the first resurrection." With respect to others, who have here resisted the offers of God, or have never had those offers made to them with any clearness of revelation; this restoration will be chiefly effected in a further state of probation; in that place or condition called in Scripture, Gehenna, or hell, through a process called in Scripture the "second death." All things will, according to this school, be restored, when from every mouth that ever praised the great Father with a conscious praise, or might but for its fall have praised him so, breaks forth the voice of praise and thanksgiving to him who had, through processes however painful for the time, sought them, found them, and brought them back.

Of the writers of this school, we know of no one in our day who has presented the view with so much ability and so much apparent show of Scriptural authority, as the Rev. Andrew Jukes, whom we now propose to review. He has written many works which have not come under our notice, and which doubtless bear more or less upon the question before us: but in his "Restitution of All Things," he has given us his view on it with the distinctness and the fulness to which he considers it entitled. If we

* "The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment." By the Rev. H. CONSTABLE. Longman's; price One Shilling.

Digitized by Google

have understood his theory as he has here put it forward, and the arguments by which he has here sought to establish it, we presume that we will have considered all that he would suppose necessary for its full and satisfactory discussion. We will also occasionally refer to an article of his, on the same subject, entitled, "Annihilation," in the *Rainbow* for July last.

One great recommendation of Mr. Juke's view is, that it is beyond any question *a restitution of all things.* If in other respects it agrees with Scripture, no doubt it agrees with it in making all things once more what they were—very good. If he can establish his view, he has certainly through it abolished the evil which God has declared shall be abolished. We look for this evil and nowhere find it. It is not in heaven; it is not on earth; it has vanished out of hell. All that has breath, with one consent, in one unbroken harmony, praises God.

This grand merit of completeness and fulness Mr. Jukes' view no doubt possesses, and this in some respects gives his a decided advantage over systems, in some particulars agreeing with it, while they do not go all its length. He agrees with Origen to the fullest extent. He empties hell, and destroys no individual life.

We only wonder at his little apparent hesitation, when he comes to what every man who pretends to discuss this question must come—*the question of the future of the fallen angels.* (130). Mr. Jukes' premises lead him with resistless force to the conclusion that fallen angels will and must be restored as much as fallen men. He accepts the natural immortality of all spirits, and supposes that the existence they once derived from God, is an existence of which they will never be deprived. He renounces with a holy indignation the theory of Augustine, which in consigning any finite creatures to endless torment, makes God the perpetrator of a cruelty and an injustice never attributed to demon or to man. He makes the fire of hell, the second death, to be a process of restoration and recovery. He cannot then avoid the conclusion that devils will be restored Yet he puts most of his arguments for their recovery *into the mouth of a second person* (pp. 129—132); through this channel claims for them a share in Christ's redemption; and the distinct promise of Scripture that they shall be restored; and only says when this convenient personage has exhausted all his arguments—"to all this I have nothing to say in reply; but I confess I cannot see that God would be dishonoured by such a conclusion of the great mystery"! (132.) Why, Mr. Jukes, should there be any hesitation? Why do you only accept with timid word another's plea? Why do you place in another's mouth what comes most suitably from your own? If your argument for the sinner's restoration from hell is worth the paper on which it is printed, it is *at least* equally good for the restoration of the devil and all his angels. We confess that we wonder at the half apologistic tone in which Mr. Jukes discusses the future of the fallen angels, and are unable to assign a cause. We must be satisfied with knowing that Mr. Jukes does restore them, and that every argument of his book leaves him *no other alternative.* But his *manner* in doing so is not good; it is that of a man who must needs advance an argument which he is half-ashamed to use.

We must here draw our reader's careful attention to what is the real basis of all such theories as Mr. Jukes', namely, *the supposed immortality of all*

Digitized by Google

men. In his "Restitution of All Things," Mr. Jukes assumes this main point as scarcely requiring any proof. In two or three places he refers to it very briefly. In one place he tells us, that "death cannot be the end of existence to a being like man, made in God's image;" and in another, that God did not make man to be "annihilated" (pp. 69, 80). And with little beyond this quiet assumption of the very chiefest question in this whole controversy, he proceeds to establish his view of what is meant by the "second death."

It will readily be seen of what vital consequence to Mr. Jukes is this doctrine of man's inalienable immortality. We have taught in Scripture the abolition of evil, and the restoration of all things to their original condition. It is quite plain that this restoration could be effected in either of these two ways; first, by a universal restoration of fallen man to God's image, a restoration including all who ever had life; secondly, a restoration of such only as accepted certain conditions of salvation, and a destruction of such as refused them. By either of these ways, we have all things living once more what they were—very good—we have God's world once again, what it was before sin had entered.

But if there be such a truth as an immortality inalienably attached by God to every man, an immortality of which no conduct on his part can deprive him, it follows as a matter of course that we are shut out from our second way of restitution, and compelled to adopt the first. If no man or angel, however degraded and fallen from their first estate, however removed by their own guilty will from the place which God first gave them, can suffer the loss of existence or life, then there is no other way of abolishing evil except by their restoration to the dignity, and holiness, and purity which they had abandoned. Resting on this dogma of an inalienable immortality, Mr. Jukes can force his conclusion of a universal restoration of the fallen, for in no other way can all things become very good!

And besides this, by thus quietly shutting out the doctrine which we maintain as the doctrine of the primitive Church and of Scripture, namely, immortality in and through Christ, loss of immortality to all out of Christ, Mr. Jukes advances his theory *as the only opponent to that of Augustine and his school.* This is a wonderful advantage. The more men's minds dwell soberly and calmly on the too common doctrine of eternal life in agony in hell, as the sentence of God on myriads of his creatures, the more they revolt against it. What would be abhorrent to all our ideas of love, and mercy, and justice, we refuse to attribute to that Being from whom we have derived those ideas, and whose love, and mercy, and justice, are like ours, only purer, deeper, more unswerving. Augustine's doctrine of hell, our heritage from the cruelty of heathenism and the dark bigotry of the middle ages of Christianity, is fast becoming a view which offends the devout Christian mind as much as it affords matter of reproach and scorn to the infidel. We are fast learning to loathe a dogma which makes "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," whose loving mercy is over all his works, whose justice is perfect, a Being of a cruelty and an injustice surpassing all we have ever read in the annals of human cruelty and wrong. How strong a recommendation then to a theory to make it *the only substitute and refuge from Augustine's hell!*

Mr. Jukes is not slow to perceive this, and he acts upon it all through his book. He supposes his theory the only real rival to that of the vulgar

Digitized by Google

hell. He tells his readers that if they do not accept it they must fall back upon that view of the second death which makes it to "consist in never-ending torment, so endless that after the lapse of ages on ages the punishment of the wicked shall be no nearer its end than when it first commenced." (26). If this were indeed the alternative, we would for our part accept of Origen before Augustine. We would rely upon the great character of God given to us by himself—we would rely upon his own truth of the "restitution of all things"—and then, with the best grace we could, proceed to show that "death" meant a condition of "life," and that "everlasting" meant no more than "enduring for some stated time." We would feel that we were making language the sport of wit, destroying the freedom of the human will, opening out the floodgates of iniquity to overwhelm good, but yet even all this before the view of such a God as Augustine paints, such a future as Tertullian describes.

We hail it, however, as one of the incalculable benefits that the *Rainbow* has conferred upon the church by affording room for the discussion of the question, that Mr. Jukes has seen it necessary to attempt to prove in its pages what he has assumed in his book, namely, the inalienable immortality of man. (*Rainbow* for July, pp. 305—313). We have ourselves written something on the subject in the *Rainbow*, which we hope may be of some use, not "condemning Plato," as Mr. Jukes says we have done, for his noble aspirations, but showing that his arguments for man's natural immortality are insufficient, and pointing the believer's true hopes for eternal life to God's promise in Jesus Christ. To Mr. Maude's most valuable paper in the *Rainbow* for March, we are, however, indebted for obliging Mr. Jukes to come from mere assumptions to arguments. Mr. Maude has so put the question that henceforth *man's inalienable immortality cannot be passed over as a matter of course.* Our opponents, whether of the schools of Augustine or Origen, must henceforth direct a great deal of their attention to this point. Plato on the nature of man is no longer regarded as infallible authority. What saith man's great Maker on the nature of his creature? We will listen to no other authority for man's destiny, than the source from whence he derived his origin.

Accordingly, Mr. Jukes has found it necessary to apply himself to the arguments of Mr. Maude. He has done so in a very able paper, entitled "*Annihilation,*" in the *Rainbow* for July last. We are not now adverting to this for the purpose of answering Mr. Juke's objections to Mr. Maude's reasoning. Mr. Maude does not require our defence, nor would we presume, unasked, to give it. We merely avail ourselves of this article to draw the attention of our readers to the best arguments which a man of distinguished scholarship and ability, and who has moreover devoted the deep thoughts of a lifetime to the subject, is able to give for the popular doctrine of the immortality of man. No one has searched the Scriptures with closer scrutiny on this point than Mr. Jukes. No man is more deeply interested than he. His favourite theory rests upon it. His reputation as a teacher reposes on it. Few are able to present it with equal power. We can expect no more in favour of it from any source than he presents. Let us listen to Mr. Juke's reasons from God's word for the inalienable immortality of man.

And here we would, in passing on to his arguments, notice his habit, and that of all writers of the schools of Origen and Augustine, of describing

Digitized by Google

that doctrine of *destruction which both alike dread,* as "*The doctrine of annihilation.*" This is the heading of Mr. Jukes' paper in the *Rainbow,* and all our opponents are perpetually harping on this word "annihilation." Now we do say that Mr. Jukes uses it *intentionally* as a little rhetorical artifice, but its use by him and by others has all the effect of a rhetorical artifice with unthinking persons. We will just explain this, and then ask Mr. Jukes and others to abandon the term. The word "annihilation" is generally used in a philosophical sense, and in this sense philosophers have agreed that there is no such thing as annihilation. "We have," says Abercrombie in his 'Intellectual Powers,' "in fact no conception of annihilation; and our whole experience is opposed to the belief that one atom which ever existed has ceased to exist." (p. 33.) Now for our part we quite agree with this. We do not believe that any particle of any kind is ever reduced by any process to absolute nonentity. A log of wood when consumed in fire *has ceased to exist as an organised substance, but its component parts remain to enter into fresh organisations.* The log of wood has perished: its parts are in as perfect existence as ever. Now the theory of eternal death or destruction, whether as regards the bodies or the spirits of the wicked, is in perfect conformity with this. We never dream that their parts are annihilated. Whatever body and spirit are, whatever be the difference between what is called material and immaterial, whether there be an essential difference, or none at all, we do not suppose that what either is made of is annihilated in the destruction of the wicked. We only mean that the *organised being,* composed of spirit and body, has ceased to exist, just as the consumed log of wood has ceased to exist. As to whatever they are made of we neither affirm nor believe any such thing. They may enter into fresh organisations as the Creator ordains. But that which constitutes identity—whatever that is—is gone. The wicked, whether men or angels, have ceased to be: they have perished and are destroyed.

Now in calling our theory of eternal death a theory of annihilation, our opponents, whether consciously or unconsciously, raise an unjust prejudice against it. They make unthinking persons suppose that we hold that doctrine of philosophical annihilation which philosophers deny. We know from experience that some of them are ever on the watch for our unguarded use of this term; and where we avoid its use, attribute it to us that they may have a philosophical weapon in their hands to demolish us with, when their theological weapons are broken. We could give some amusing instances of this if space permitted. We are sorry to find that Mr. Jukes must share in this blame. He, too, we are sure from misapprehension, opposes us in this fruitless way: "to me," he says, "it is not one of the least inconsistencies of those who hold the notion of man's annihilation, that holding, as they do, matter to be imperishable, spite of all its destructions, which are in fact changes, they still hold that spirit, which is the root of all matter, can be annihilated. But they know neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." (*Rainbow,* 313.)

Now with all respect, Mr. Jukes, it is you who are guilty of affirming of us what you do not know, and what we do not hold. What spirit is, we do not presume to define. Whether it be one with matter, or essentially different from matter, or "the root of matter," as you tell us, we do not undertake to decide. We are sure that no living man can define it, for we are sure no living man comprehends it. We are aware that a great deal may be

Digitized by Google

said about it, and that a great deal has been said about it, but whatever has come under our notice that has been said, has always appeared to us fine-sounding phrases of men who spoke of what they did not understand.

As we freely confess that we do not understand the composition or nature of spirit, and as we fully believe that others are in as perfect ignorance, we do not believe its comprehension to be of any importance to us in our present state. But whatever "spirit" be, we beg leave to assure Mr. Jukes that we hold it just as imperishable as matter; we affirm no more of one than we affirm of the other. Mr. Jukes may remove it from the list of our "inconsistencies." We hold the death or destruction of "spirit," just as we hold the destruction of matter. The entire being of the wicked—say matter animated by spirit—will cease to exist in its organisation; but we do not hold that one single atom of that entire being will cease to exist. We will therefore feel obliged by Mr. Jukes, and others, ceasing to call our doctrine one of annihilation. If they persist in doing so, when we disclaim the title, and show that it belongs to us no more than it belongs to them, we will certainly hold them guilty of a little rhetorical artifice, wholly unworthy of seekers after truth.

We will now proceed to consider Mr. Jukes' arguments in proof of his great fundamental position, *that man can never cease to exist in one kind of life or other.* And here we must say that Mr. Jukes' theory compels him to use words in a sense in which they are not commonly taken, and which makes a review of his opinions rather perplexing to the reviewer. This runs through all Mr. Jukes' writings, so far as we can judge, and makes it particularly difficult to understand him. Thus in the present case he contends for "*the eternal nature of man's spirit;*" but this with him is quite a different thing from "*its immortality*" (*Rainbow* 311). Man's spirit, he tells us is "*mortal,*" and yet it can have no "end of existence." Now this is not the language of common life. The immortality of the soul in common speech is quite a different thing from its immortality in the mouth of Mr. Jukes. We just mention this to show the exceeding difficulty of reviewing Mr. Jukes. We really feel in reading him that it is like learning a new language. If we ever err in attributing to his words a sense different from what he means, we will be by no means surprised. We will endeavour not to do so. But we must say, that if our observations are in any considerable degree correct, they constitute in themselves a powerful argument against his entire theory. A theory which cannot be presented by words taken in their natural and common sense is and must be untenable. If anyone does not understand what we mean, we will only ask him to read carefully through an article or a book of Mr. Jukes, and then sit down to review it. If he is not often perplexed to understand his meaning, surprised at his use of terms, and perhaps, after the most careful efforts, obliged to confess that he is not quite sure that he has attained his sense; we will frankly allow him to be possessed of a clearer power of vision than we are. Mr. Jukes will probably attribute it to some imperfection on our part; to our looking at his words as they are "*seen by sense.*" This we shall not determine, but we freely own a great difficulty at times to comprehend him.

The first argument we will notice of Mr. Jukes against our theory of the destruction of the wicked is drawn from man's creation by God. "*To a being like man,*" he tells us in one place, "*made in God's image, death*

Digitized by Google

cannot be the end of existence" (p. 69). And in another place he repeats the same argument somewhat more fully, "Adam was the son of God, made in his image . . . *and therefore*, though fallen and mortal, *with a life, like its Begetter, is and must be eternal*" (*Rainbow* 308). This is an argument repeatedly in the mouths of the disciples both of Origen's and Augustine's schools. It has a fine imposing sound, but really nothing but a sound. To be of any weight the argument must run thus, "man was made in God's image and could not *in any particular* lose the image in which he was created." If the argument *put thus* is a good argument, we will freely allow that there is great weight in it, as it is put by Mr. Jukes. But when put thus, it is seen at a glance to have no weight at all. We might no doubt draw out a fine sounding, *a priori* argument, that nothing made by God could deteriorate and become inferior to what it was when made by him. We might reason that to suppose so would detract from the perfections of the Creator far more than from those of the creature. But when one comes to man, and to sad facts about man, we find our *priori* argument scattered to the winds. Man who was made in God's image, lost, as Mr. Jukes freely allows and insists on, very much of that image. By the fall, he tells us, "*the divine life in man's soul was poisoned and destroyed, and man was separated from God, and died to God's world*" (p. 69). We will ask Mr. Jukes why, if man might lose one part, and that the highest of God's image, namely, his purity and goodness, he might not also lose another, and an inferior part, namely, God's continued existence? If he might lose one part he certainly might lose another. We do not question the propriety of saying that to man was given at creation a life like the angels, and different from that of brutes. We hold that this was *one* of those respects, and a very important one, for which he is said to have been made in God's image. But we know that it was not the only or the chief respect. He was made in God's image in other respects as much, and if he lost, as we knew he did lose, his resemblance to God in goodness, he might also lose it in existence. For Mr. Jukes to say that man could not lose God's image is contrary to Scripture, and inconsistent with his own admissions. To say that he could lose it in one respect and not lose in another, without any proof of this from Scripture, is simply to set oneself up for an infallible authority, which Mr. Jukes does not pretend to be.

Another argument on which Mr. Jukes relies for the eternity of man's soul, is based on the *manner* in which its creation is spoken of. Man's soul, he tells us, is eternal like that of God, "because his spirit is *breathed into him by* God" (Gen. ii. 7), (a thing never said of the beasts . . . . .). (*Rainbow*, 312.) Mr. Jukes is too good a scholar to appeal to this text in the way that many who are ignorant of Hebrew appeal to it. He knows that the Hebrew words here translated "*living soul*" are frequently applied to beasts as well as to man, and that they too are said to possess the "*breath of life*" as well as man. He knows that the lower creation is said to possess what man possesses, namely, body, soul, and spirit; and that consequently no reliance can be placed upon them in proof of the eternity of human nature. But still Mr. Jukes does not like to abandon altogether this long and cruelly abused text of Gen. ii. 7. He thinks he sees *something* said in it of man's creation which is not said of the creation of the beasts. That something is that "*God breathed into*

Digitized by Google

Adam the breath of life." In order that this argument should be of any use we must suppose that *God did not breathe into the lower creatures their breath of life.* How does Mr. Jukes know this ? Will he tell us whence they derived it except from God's breathing it into them ? For our part we are perfectly satisfied that God did breathe it into them, as he breathed it into man. We might safely assume that if he did not do so they would never had life. But in reality Scripture in other places affirms of all creation what it here says of man's. "By the word of the Lord," David says, "were the heavens made, *and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth*:" and elsewhere we read thus of the creation of the brutes: "*Thou (God) sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created.*" (Psa. xxxiii. 6; civ. 30.) Of Gen. ii. 7, we have only to say that God in it gave *a fuller account* of the creation of man than he had given in Gen. i. of the creation either of the lower creatures or of man, and therefore uses additional words. Such are the shifts to which men of ability are forced to have recourse when they would prove from Scripture the eternity or, as we would call it, the inalienable immortality of man.

But in I Cor. xv. 22, Mr. Jukes finds a text which, according to him, clearly establishes his position that no individual of the human race shall finally lose his being and existence. (46.) The text runs thus: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The "all" here he tells us includes universal man. If Mr. Jukes were correct in the application of this text it would no doubt, however contradictory as thus used to other Scriptures, affirm what he says. But the entire context of the passage shows us that Paul is here speaking only of the first resurrection, and of those who, as having fallen asleep in Christ, have part in this first resurrection. *All these shall be made alive in Christ at the resurrection of the just,* as they all suffer the first death in Adam. The apostle must be allowed to explain his own words, and it is thus that he has explained them (verses 18—20). And although writers of the schools of Augustine and Origen are ever catching at a passage here and there in this magnificent description of the resurrection of the redeemed of Christ, far the greater number of commentators, and far the ablest commentators, are agreed that this chapter speaks only of those who are on this earth saved and redeemed through the work of Christ.

But in his attempt to overthrow the theory of the destruction and death of the wicked, as we understand these terms, Mr. Jukes has recourse to a very extraordinary statement which will require full examination. "Death," according to him, *never means in Scripture the extinction of life or being,* but *a change of life, a condition of existence.* Lest we should be accused of misrepresenting him, we will give his own words. "What is death? Take any of the deaths *which Scripture speaks of,* and which we know. Was Adam's death, in the day he sinned, annihilation? When his spirit died to God, was this annihilation? When was this annihilation? When his body died and turned to dust, was this annihilation? Is our death in trespasses and sins annihilation? Is our death to sin annihilation? When the corn of wheat falls to the ground and dies, is it annihilation; or is St. Paul right in saying, 'that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die'? Do not these uses of the word prove beyond all question that, whatever else these deaths may be, *not one of them is non-existence,* or annihilation?" (*Rainbow,* 306.)

Digitized by Google

And, farther on, he adopts as "true" the assertion of Mr. Strong, that "*death nowhere in the word of God means non-existence, but always a certain condition of existence.*" (*Rainbow*, 307.)

In showing the radical error of these assertions, made from the opposite standpoints of Augustine's and Origen's theories, we would first point out the fatal objection that lies against them, arising from this, that they make *the language of Scripture and the language of common life distinct and different languages.* Let our readers mark Mr. Strong's assertion just quoted, that "death, nowhere *in the word of God,* means non-existence." He could not say that death *nowhere* means non-existence, for we have only to open our dictionaries, no matter in what language, in order to find that, invariably, *the primary* meaning attached to death is non-existence, and that if those dictionaries ever give the sense attached to the term by writers of theology, they give it at the very end of their definitions, and generally mark it *as peculiar to theology.* Thus, if we look at Johnson's dictionary, we find his *first* definition of death to be, "*the extinction of life,*" and his tenth and last definition (carefully marked *in theology*), "*eternal torments!*" or, what Mr. Strong would call, "a condition of existence." Now, against this distinction of the language of Scripture from that of common life we here enter our solemn protest. The language of Scripture, beyond that of any other book which was ever composed, is the language of common life, of men and women not speaking scientifically, or technically, but as they speak together of the affairs which concern them all in common. The language of Scripture is not the language of a school, of a sect, of a nation, of a rank in life: it is the language of our common universal humanity. When the gospel of Christ was preached, it was spoken to mankind in their well-known familiar tongue. No new language was formed for them, but they were addressed in the language familiar to them from infancy, common to them with their fellow-townsmen and fellow-villagers. Whenever, therefore, we find men using terms in a sense not in common use, or pretending that the language of the Bible differs from the common language of the period when it was written, we may be sure that these men are setting up some system alien from the teaching of Scripture, and requiring the perversion of its language. We do not say they pervert it intentionally, but they do so in fact. In this instance, what "death" meant in the ear of the Greek and the barbarian, it meant as used in Scripture, and the primary meaning of death among mankind was the loss of existence.

But we will show even from Mr. Jukes own words that he himself is forced thus to use it at times; though he quotes with approval Mr. Strong's assertion, that "death in the word of God *means always a certain condition of existence.*" *Mr. Jukes holds with us bodily death to be death.* He correctly defines *the death of the body to be its being "turned to dust"* (*Rainbow*, 306). Will Mr. Jukes tells us *what kind of existence* the body has, when it is turned to dust! Its material atoms indeed are not philosophically annihilated, but we presume Mr. Jukes will allow that the body which has died has ceased to exist or to possess life or existence of any kind beyond any other clod of earth. This is what we mean by death: this is the common meaning of death: this is one of the deaths mentioned in the word of God: and by this death, even Mr. Jukes is forced to confess, is meant the loss of life or existence: and we have thus Mr. Jukes himself

Digitized by Google

confessing that *death sometimes in the word of God means non-existence, and does not always mean a certain condition of existence!*

And we will now apply ourselves to show that what Mr. Jukes says the Scripture *never* means by death it *always* means, namely, *the non-existence of that which is said to have died.* But we must first notice Mr. Jukes' *very incorrect representation* of what we teach when we speak of death as non-existence. He supposes us (*Rainbow*, 306), to affirm that whenever Scripture speaks of death we suppose it to signify "annihilation," *that is the cessation of existence of the entire man, body, soul, and spirit.* We do nothing of the kind. Death, as we find it used in Scripture, just as we find it used elsewhere, *is variously applied,* and all that we suppose it to mean in any place is *the non-existence of that to which it is applied,* and of which it is affirmed. Now the entire force of Mr. Jukes' high sounding queries, depends on *this misrepresentation of what we say.* He asks triumphantly—"When Adam's body died and turned to dust was this annihilation? Is our death in trespasses and sins annihilation?" (*Rainbow*, 306.) Most assuredly neither the one nor the other is "annihilation" in the sense in which Mr. Jukes uses the phrases, *the cessation of the existence of the entire man.* But then we never affirmed that it was, nor do we hold it any more than Mr. Jukes or Mr. Strong. When the body dies, all we say is that *the body dies:* we do not say that another part of man dies: his soul or spirit may still survive; we have not then affirmed *their* death. But Mr. Jukes supposes that in speaking of the death of the body we mean a great deal more than the death of the body. We do not know how he gathers this, but we beg to assure him that it is not the fact. All that we say is, that whenever Scripture speaks of death it affirms *the non-existence of that which is said to be dead,* whether it means physical or spiritual death—whether it speaks of the body only, or of both body and spirit—whether it speaks of partial or total destruction. This we will now proceed to show.

The first *mention* of death in Scripture occurs in Gen. ii. 17, where God declares it to be *the penalty of Adam's sin,* if Adam should disobey; "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." This death was not synonymous with Adam's becoming a sinner, but was to be a consequence of his becoming one. His sin was his own act; his death was God's infliction. God had no part whatever in the first: God is the agent in the second. Adam's death was just as distinct from, yet connected with, and following from his sin as was that of the idolatrous dreamer of dreams, who was to be "put to death because he spoke to turn away Israel from God," distinct from the lying dreams with which he sought to delude the people (Deut. xiii. 5). Death in both cases was not the offence itself, or the perverted mind which led to the offence, but was the penalty which law ordained for the offence. We see thus that whatever was the death threatened to Adam it was not his sin, or the disposition of mind which led to his sin. God had no hand in producing these. God warned Adam against these. These were the result of Adam's guilty abuse of his free will. The death of Adam to his loyalty and obedience to God, *i.e.* his spiritual death, was not the death God threatened him with at all. Adam wilfully and guiltily died to God in the old relation of an obedient son to his father, and the death he thereby incurred was the father's penalty for the son's disobedience.

Digitized by Google

God did not bring spiritual death upon Adam: Adam brought it on himself. What was death?—*God's penalty.*

We observe in the history of this old transaction, that God spoke to Adam of death as a thing *with whose nature Adam was acquainted,* and indeed the threatening of a penalty whose nature was unknown, would be unworthy of any lawgiver—most of all unworthy of the great just lawgiver who is the source of law. Adam then knew what death meant before he himself, through sin, became subject to its law. How and whence did he know this? Plainly and certainly from its operation on creatures lower than himself—the birds of the air—the fishes of the sea—the beasts of the field. These were in existence before he received his life from God. Scripture tell us this. *They were not made immortal, but were made subject to death.* After life, *death* came to them. What they were made from—dust—that they became again when the Creator withdrew by the operation of a great natural law the breath of life which he had breathed into them. The science of geology tells us, that life thus succeeded by death, had been the condition of this world during ages of incalculable length. Adam knew this. When he gave to the lower creatures their names, he knew their nature to be mortal, to be subject to death, to be ordained to the loss of life.

Adam, therefore, knew perfectly well what death meant, when it was spoken of to him, not as the law of his nature, but as the penalty of his possible sin. It was not explained to him by the lawgiver, because he wanted no explanation. If it had meant *life* in any condition, a change of existence for good or evil, life in agony, or any of those meanings which our theorists of Augustine's and Origen's schools put on it, there would have been an imperative necessity on God's part thus to explain it as a simple act of justice to his new creature, man. Unexplained, it meant in Adam's case what it meant in the case of the lower creatures. Adam knew life, its joy, its glory, its dignity: he knew this his life might be eternal—he also knew that the penalty of sin consisted in its loss. He too would, if a sinner, lie down in the dust of the ground, oblivion would cover him, the sinner would pass away out of existence, just as the beast of the field. He would have chosen to be independent of God, and death would show him that he could not draw one breath without the will of God.

We thus see the simple original primary sense of death and whence it was derived. It had no reference whatever to change of disposition, to becoming evil from good, or good from evil. It had no reference whatever to any change in the mode or condition of life, or to the place where this might be. It had the simple unmixed sense of *loss of existence.* The beasts of God's creation knew no change of disposition which could originate any of those secondary senses of death, which man's higher nature has given rise to since his fall. The beasts of God's creation looked forward to no life after this, and man knew that they had none. When they closed their eyes in death they simply lost existence, and thus the loss of existence was the idea which Adam formed of death when he was told "in the day thou eatest thou shalt die." This primitive notion of death has come down to us from that first day to this last age as our primary sense of death. If you doubt it, open your dictionary at the word "death," and you will see.

Digitized by Google

But here a grave objection meets us. It is said "man's death is not the same in one most material respect with that of beasts, and therefore the notion of man's death was not based on that of the lower creation." We have not here space to reply to this. We hope to do so in the next number of the *Rainbow*, if the Editor can afford us space. We do not deny the distinction above insisted on; we hold it ourselves to be true. And yet we also hold with the writer of Ecclesiastes, that "that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, all have one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity." (Eccl. iii. 19.)

HENRY CONSTABLE,
Desertmore Glebe. Prebendary of Cork.

THE EVIL AGE.

"And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to him for to show him the buildings of the temple. (2.) And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. (3.) And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? (4.) And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you. (5.) For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. (6.) And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet."—Matthew xxiv. 1—6.

'AND Jesus went out, and departed from the temple:' Or rather, according to the best reading, 'And Jesus went out from the temple and departed.' This arrangement of the words is given in the manuscripts which are noted ℵ B D L Δ, 133 (the queen of the cursives), 69. And it is supported by the great body of the ancient versions, the Italic, Vulgate, Syriac (Peshito, Philoxenian, Harclean, and Jerusalem), Coptic, Armenian, Æthiopic. The Lord, strange to say, had not been welcomed in his own home, his Father's house, and therefore he left it, that he might, during the fraction of time that was yet before him, finish in other respects the work that was given him to do. 'And his disciples came to (him): Or, approached.' He had apparently been striding on before, wrapped in his own thoughts. He would probably leave the temple-area either by the Golden gate on the east side of the enclosure, or by the Triple gate on the south side. (See Count de Vogüe's "Temple de Jérusalem," plates 16 and 36.) The disciples followed at a respectful distance—at once awed and bewildered. They wished, however, to have a clearer idea of what he meant when he said, "Lo, your house is left unto you desolate" (chap. xxiii. 38), and hence they quickened their steps and approached their Lord, first one of them, and then another. (See Mark xiii. 1.)—'To shew him the buildings of the temple:' It was an indirect way of attempting to draw him out to speak to them concerning the future fate of the edifice and concerning his schemes in general in relation to his own future and the future of his kingdom. It is as if they had said, 'Speak to us still further.

Digitized by Google

Speak to us explicitly. There are strange tumults in our hearts. We cannot see afar off. We should like to see. We had expected that this house would be the very centre of thy theocracy. Since Herod has enlarged and so marvellously adorned it, at such vast expense, and after so many years of toil, it seems worthy to be used by thee in the interests of thy kingdom. It looks to us as if it might be, and should be, 'an eternal excellency,' or at least, 'a joy of many generations,' unto which, as Isaiah says, 'All nations might flow' to worship the God of Jacob. See these buildings all round and round the Holy and Most Holy Place! How massive! How magnificent! Could anything be grander?' It was a saying among the Rabbis, "He that never saw the temple of Herod, never saw a fine building." (See Lightfoot's *Exercitations*, in loc.)

(2). 'But he answered and said unto them'—such seems to be the correct reading, slightly differing from that of the received text. It is given by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford—'See ye not all these things?' an interrogation that has given unnecessary trouble to many interpreters. Casaubon is positive that the *not* should be cancelled. So is Fritzsche. Olearius, again, would remove the interrogative element altogether, and turn the expression into an injunction, 'Admire not all these things.' Paulus, too, would interpret thus, 'Give yourselves no concern in reference to all this (that is, all this edifice).' Both of these critics, however, overlooked a certain peculiarity of the negative particle; (not the subjective μή but οὐ). Meyer also has, from the first, felt perplexed, and would now interpret the words thus, without interrogation, 'Ye see not all this.' But there is not the slightest reason for objecting to the interrogation; and there is no real difficulty with the interpretation. The expression 'all these things' does not refer definitely to 'the buildings of the temple.' It refers to these buildings only in so far as they were contingently connected with a more generic class of things, the things of dread significance to which our Saviour had been referring in some of his concluding remarks within the courts of the Gentiles. See chap. xxiii. 36, where the same expression occurs. It is as if he had said, 'Are ye yet in the dark? Do ye not yet understand that Judaism is doomed, as a thing thoroughly effete and incurably corrupt? Do ye not understand that Jerusalem, the centre of Judaism, is doomed, as a city full of incurable corruption? Do ye not understand that this temple, as the centre of Jerusalem, and the centre too, alas! of Jerusalem's incurable corruption and hypocrisy, is also doomed? Do ye not see these things? Nothing lies more clearly before the eye of my mind.' When the morals of a people become thoroughly corrupt, no political expedients will long succeed in averting social ruin and physical degradation. 'There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.' The expression rendered 'one stone upon another' is literally 'a stone upon a stone.' The word rendered 'thrown down' is translated 'overthrown' in Acts v. 39, and 'dissolved' in 2 Cor. v. 1. It etymologically means 'loosened down.' Sir John Cheke renders it here 'loused awai.' A compound idea is expressed. There is, first, the notion of *detachment* of stone from stone. And then there is the notion of *throwing down* the detached stones, a process of destruction that could be carried on in the case of all the buildings without exception on the area of the temple, in consequence of the natural and artificial elevation of the area all round and round. The Saviour's

Digitized by Google

prediction was fulfilled to the letter. "The language was spoken," says Dr. Robinson, "of the buildings of the temple, the splendid fane itself, and its magnificent porticos; and in this sense the prophecy has been terribly fulfilled, even to the utmost letter." (*Researches*, vol. i. p. 436.) Portions indeed, of the substructions of the walls, that were laboriously raised to enlarge the temple-area, are still standing as they were in our Saviour's days, intensely interesting relics of a departed architectural glory. But, as Thrupp remarks, "Of the whole of the walls and buildings of the inner court, we may verily say that not one stone has been left upon another; and even the raised platform on which the inner court stood has been levelled with the rest of the area. The whole of the porticos of the outer court have in like manner disappeared; and even of the ancient external walls not a stone remains reaching up and visible above the floor of the area on which the prophecy was delivered." (*Ancient Jerusalem*, p. 398.)

(3). 'But as he sat on the mount of Olives': which rises, to the east, about 270 feet higher than the temple-mount, and from which, therefore, there would be a most commanding and imposing view of all the temple erections and of the whole city. Our Saviour, having left the temple, and crossed the brook Kidron, slowly ascended Olivet. There was more than a prophet's burden on his heart. He would often pause, as he ascended; and turn round and look, and sigh or weep. Every foot of the ground, on which he was treading, was historic, and classic, and sacred; he was making it still more sacred, and classic, and historic. The future was unrolling itself to his gaze, his own future, the future of Jerusalem, of the Jews, of the world. At length he reached some comparatively secluded spot, where there was a convenient ledge of rock, and the friendly shelter, it may be, of olive trees; and he seated himself. It was drawing towards evening. The shadows were lengthening. The coolness was delightful. The wearied populace were dispersed or dispersing to their evening quarters; and none but his chosen apostles were near him.—'The disciples came unto him privately:—Privately,' that is, apart from the more miscellaneous followers who had surrounded him in the temple, and had continued, stragglingly, to follow him up to the mountain-side, animated by wonder and curiosity, but beginning perhaps, to suspect that they had been too hasty after all in their hosannahs. 'There is majesty in his mien!' 'He looks as if he were worthy to be a king!' 'But is he not too poor?'—"Peter, James, John, and Andrew," gradually approach, and seat themselves beside him, and enter into talk. (Mark xiii. 3.) By-and-by the entire group of the brethren cluster around, and the solemn conversation proceeds.—'Saying, tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the age?' The word 'coming,' though a good translation of the original term (*παρουσία*), is not literal. Literally the Greek term means 'presence;' and so it is rendered in 2 Corinthians x. 10; Philippians ii. 12. In all other passages, however, it is rendered 'coming.' Luther's version corresponds (*Zukunft*); but Funckherrott, in his uncouth attempt at absolute literality, renders the term 'essence-beside,' (*weessenheit da beyhim*).—Instead of the word 'age,' our authorised version has 'world'—doubtless an unhappy rendering, and exceedingly inexact. "The disciples do not ask," says Lightfoot, "the signs of the Messiah's coming—as we believe it—at the last day, to judge both the quick and the dead." (*Exercitations*, in loc.)

Digitized by Google

In the original, the word is *αἰών*, and has reference, not to the material of the earth or universe, but to "a space of time." Compare the use of the word in the plural—Luke i. 33; Rom. i. 25; ix. 5; xi. 36; xvi. 27; 1 Cor. x. 11; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Gal. i. 5; Heb. xiii. 8, 21; Rev. i. 18; iv. 9, 10; &c. In all these passages there is reference, not to "the worlds," but to "the ages." The disciples ask two questions, not three, as Grotius and many more represent it. The first is simple, embodying but one idea, 'When shall these things be?' The second is compound, and double-folding, 'What shall be the sign of thy presence and of the age's end?' It is assumed by the questioners that with the presence of Christ there would be 'the end of the age.' In the correct text (that of ℵ B C L, 1, 33) there is no article before the word 'end.' It was not needed, though it might have been employed. The 'age,' to which the disciples made reference, was the then "present evil age." (Gal. i. 4.) It is still "present." It is the age when evil is predominant—the age that precedes the golden age of the world's history. Happy for the earth will it be when this latter age is inaugurated! Happy when the preceding age will be ended! Unhappy, however, for many individuals, will the time of the transition be! As to the prior of the two questions, 'When shall these things be?' the demonstrative pronoun 'these' looks back to the expression 'all these' as occurring in verse 2, and thence back to the same expression as occuring in chap. xxiii. 36. It enfolds within itself a special reference to the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem. See the second clause of verse 2, and compare chap. xxiii. 35—38; also chap. xxii. 6, 7.

(4.) 'And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no one deceive you'; His first words are, most fittingly, words of caution. 'You ask questions on momentous subjects. See to it that you do not allow yourselves to be led astray, when I shall have left you!' The word rendered 'Take heed,' literally means 'See, or look, or behold.' Wycliffe and Sir John Cheke render it 'see.' The Rheims rendering is 'beware.' The word rendered 'deceive' (*πλανήσῃ*) literally means 'cause to err.' 'See to it, that no one cause you to err!' The Saviour is looking, specially, in the direction of the second question of his disciples; though not exclusively so. And what he says to his questioners, he intended, assuredly, not for their benefit alone, but for the benefit of all the discipleship, inclusive of the disciples that were to be, as well as of the disciples that then were.

(5.) 'For many shall come in my name:' literally, 'on my name,' founding 'on my name' their pretentions and actions. 'My name,' that is, the name of 'the Messiah, the Christ,' which belongs to me alone. 'Saying, I am Christ:' Literally, 'I am the Christ.' Luther, like our English translators, missed the article. But Felbinger, Bengel, Zinzendorf, correctly inserted it. So Dr. Daniel Scott, and the more modern translators, 'And shall deceive many:' or, 'and shall lead many astray.' See on verse 4. No doubt numbers of the impostors or enthusiasts here referred to would make their appearance before the destruction of Jerusalem. It was a time of intense religious excitement; and the religiousness that prevailed was in general unbridled and fanatical. We need not expect, however, that many, if any, of these pretended Messiahs would be able to act such a part on the great stage of society as to find a place in history. They would in general be too petty in soul, and too paltry in mental power, to

Digitized by Google

attract attention, individually, except in their own very limited circles. They would thus be somewhat like the innumerable enthusiasts, who, in succeeding ages, have fancied that they were Christ, or that at least they were, in some peculiar way or other, impersonations or impropriations of his presence and power and authority; authorised precursors at all events, and inaugurators, of his impending advent. Consider, for instance, the pretensions of the Agapēmonè Community, as exhibited in the following manifestoes: "'The sounding of the first trumpet.' (Rev. viii. 7.) I declare that God is on the throne of judgment, and that the Lamb that was slain is in the midst of it: I declare, too, that he has his throne of judgment in Br. Prince, the man whose name is THE BRANCH.—(Signed) B. Thomas. (The Agapēmonè, 17th January, 1864.)"—'The sounding of the third trumpet.' (Rev. viii. 10.) I declare that the day of Grace is past, and the door of Mercy shut: I declare, too, that Christ is come in judgment according to the Testimony of Jesus, 'Behold, He cometh.'—(Signed) Br. Verriour. (The Agapēmonè, 31st January, 1864.)" 'The sounding of the fifth Trumpet.' (Rev. ix. 1—11.) I declare that the Holy Ghost in Br. Prince took flesh, and bore in His own body the curse of its independence—that separation from God which is death, that condemnation of the devil which is hell; thereby revealing the devil as the life of the flesh, the author of its independence, and of all the sin and evil in it, the man of sin, the son of perdition: I declare, too, that the Lord Jesus Christ, who was in His Spirit in Br. Prince, did reveal Himself from heaven, consuming that wicked one with the Spirit of His mouth, and destroying him with the brightness of His coming, as the Son of Man, in his own body, Br. Prince, the man whose name is The Branch. (Signed) Br. Cobbe. (The Agapēmonè, 18th February, 1864)." These are melancholy manifestoes and manifestations, which would no doubt have their antique duplicates or correspondencies, though under unessential modifications of form, in the times that preceded the destruction of Jerusalem. See also "The Only Sacrifice" and the other publications, of James Biden, who thinks that he is "the S of man" so frequently addressed in Ezekiel, and the "one like unto Moses," and "the rod out of the stem of Jesse." He conceives that his publication, entitled 'Truths Maintained,' "fulfilled the prediction contained in the first part of Ezekiel, chapter v." He thinks that what was said concerning the sun-dial of Ahaz, "which was to be put back ten degrees," teaches "that the 185,000 Assyrians"—a symbolic number—were to be reduced to 1850, "to intimate the year in which the prophecy was fulfilled by the publication of (his book entitled) THE TRUE CHURCH." He has actually "bound Satan" too (Rev. xx. 2), and "is to rule," and "take the kingdom when sixty-two years of age." In our day, and in our country, not very many, we presume, are led astray by Mr. Biden; but in other circumstances it might have been otherwise, for he seems to be in solemn earnest, and, in his writings, wields a nervous style. Consider also the pretensions of Emanuel Swedenborg, though manifested in a peculiarly subjective, instead of objective, phase. He lays it down as a principle that "the second coming of the Lord is effected by a man, before whom he has manifested himself in person, and whom he was filled with his Spirit, to teach the doctrines of the New Church." This Man, as he conceives, was himself. ('True Christ.' Religion, chap. xiv.) Consider also the pretensions of Joanna Southcote, who gave herself out to be the woman spoken of in Revelation xii.,

Digitized by Google

and predicted that on October 19th, 1814, she would give birth to the Messiah. Her followers at one time were said to be 100,000 in number, and there are still one or two congregations in existence which look for her re-appearing along with the Christ. About the year A.D. 131 or 132, Bar-Cochba (Star-Son) appeared in the Holy Land, professing to be the "star" that was seen of old by Balaam. (Num. xxiv. 17.) He raised the banner of revolt once more against the Romans, promising deliverance from heaven to the people. The result was a most melancholy butchery. The partially resuscitated city of Jerusalem was completely razed; and in its room, and on its site, a purely Roman city or colony was erected, and called Ælia Capitolina. We do not know how much of the same spirit may have been in Theudas (Acts v. 36), or in "the Egyptian," with whom the chief captain in Jerusalem confounded Paul. (Acts xxi. 38.) And it would serve but little purpose to rake deep into such litter.

(6.) 'And ye shall hear':—A somewhat feeble translation of the original expression (μελλήσετε δὲ ἀκούειν). Literally, 'But ye shall be about to hear.' The idea is, 'But by-and-by ye shall begin to hear; ye,' the Saviour is speaking to his apostles 'as the representatives of the whole body of his disciples.' He as it were says, 'Pay no regard to the professions of any individuals who pretend to be the Christ, or the precursors of his second advent. Before that event arrive, many great changes must take place among the nations. And, to come to particulars, ye shall by-and-by begin to hear. Of wars and rumours of wars, or of wars and and of rumours of wars.' Note the "of." Ye shall begin to hear 'of wars,' as actual occurrences, 'and of rumours of wars,' as of wars likely to occur. Besides the actual wars, there will be flying reports circulating in the high places of society, and getting to be occasionally overheard by inquisitive politicians, and thence retailed descendingly to the other portions of the general public, that the relations between such-and-such sovereigns are critical, and that sooner or later there will be rupture and war. These reports, "on-dits," or "bruites" as the Rheims has it, may at first be sedulously stifled, or only cautiously whispered from ear to ear; but, says the Saviour, 'Ye shall by-and-by begin to hear of them.' Ye shall begin 'to hear of their circulation,' for people will be beginning to get uneasy, looking to the future with uncertainty and trembling. Such seems to be the purport of the phraseology: and so it is interpreted by Maldonat, de Wette, Arnoldi, &c. The expression, however, 'Ye shall hear of wars,' if rendered with extreme literality, would be, 'Ye shall hear wars.' Wycliffe rendered it thus, 'Ye ben to heere bateyls.' So did Luther; and Bengel too: and Meyer interprets accordingly, as if the Saviour were intimating that his disciples would actually be within earshot of the mustering and the tramping of the conflicting hosts, and the dreadful clash of arms. But the expression, no doubt, is correctly translated in our authorised version (see Gal. i. 13; Eph. i. 15; iii. 2; Col. i. 4); and hence the second clause, instead of meaning 'ye shall hear reports of wars' (at a distance), as antithetically distinguished from 'hearing wars' (at hand), will refer to 'the hearing of the rumours of impending wars. It is not of much moment that we should enquire minutely whether or not the disciples were in a position to 'hear of wars,' and 'of rumours of wars,' before the destruction of Jerusalem. The Saviour is referring, not to the antecedents of the destruction of Jerusalem, but to the antecedents of his second coming

Digitized by Google

and of the end of the evil age. There 'were' indeed wars, nearer and more remote, before the destruction of Jerusalem. But oh, how many have been since! What evidence they are of the continuance of the "evil age"! The earth everywhere has been empurpled with the blood of brothers, who have fought with one another as if they had been incarnated fiends.*

WHAT IS MAN?

IT may most truly be said that there is and can be no true eschatology apart from a true psychology; the latter supplying the only firm and stable foundation upon which the former can be built. In other words, we must, in our own minds, have settled the question of man's essential nature before we can be in a position to enter fairly on the further question of his future destiny. Hence the very great importance, theologically, of the question here suggested: *What is man?* A question to which three principal answers have been returned, which answers we will briefly consider.

I. We have, first, the answer of the *Materialist.* But as the genus Materialist is clearly divisible into two species (1), the Materialist *scientific,* and (2), the Materialist *theological;* and as the arguments used, and the conclusions arrived at, by each of these differ very materially, it is necessary at once to distinguish them. According to the scientific Materialist, of whom we may take Professor Huxley as the type, man is a highly organised mass of "Protoplasm;"† and as a living creature is identical, in origin, with the lowest animal, ay, with the lowest plant. "In physiological language, all the multifarious and complicated activities of man are comprehensible under three categories. Either they are immediately directed towards the maintenance and development of the body, or they effect transitory changes in the relative positions of parts of the body, or they tend towards the continuance of the species. Even those manifestations

* Extracted from Dr. JAMES MORISON'S very admirable and learned *Commentary on the New Testament,* now in course of publication, in shilling parts. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co.; Glasgow: T. D. Morison, Bath Street.

† To the question, which some readers may ask, *What is Protoplasm?* Prof. Huxley's answer is admirably graphic: "You are doubtless aware that the common nettle owes its stinging property to the innumerable stiff and needle-like, though exquisitely delicate, hairs which cover its surface. Each stinging nettle tapers from a broad base to a slender summit, which, though rounded at the end, is of such microscopic fineness that it readily penetrates, and breaks off in the skin. The whole hair consists of a very delicate outer case of wood, closely applied to the inner surface of which is a layer of semi-fluid matter, full of innumerable granules, of extreme minuteness. This semi-fluid lining is protoplasm, which thus constitutes a kind of bag, full of a limpid liquid, and roughly corresponding in form with the interior of the hair which it fills. When viewed with a sufficiently high magnifying power, the protoplasmic layer of the nettle is seen to be in a condition of unceasing activity. Local contractions of the whole thickness of its substance pass slowly and gradually from point to point, and give rise to the appearance of progressive waves, just as the bending of successive stalks of corn by a breeze produces the apparent billows of a corn-field." As regards chemical composition, he adds, "All the forms of protoplasm which have yet been examined contain the four elements, carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, in very complex union." "Fortnightly Review," March, 1869.

Digitized by Google

of intellect, of feeling, and of will, which we rightly name the higher faculties, are not excluded from this classification, inasmuch, as to every one but the subject of them, they are known only as transitory changes in the relative positions of parts of the body. Speech, gesture, and every other part of human action, are, in the long run, resolvable into muscular change in the relative positions of the parts of a muscle."* That life is anything distinct from, or added to, organised matter; that—for it in point of fact comes to this—God first made the material form of man of the dust of the ground, and *afterwards* breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and that, consequent upon this divine inbreathing, man became a living soul: all this is an obsolete notion, thus cleverly held up to ridicule: "When hydrogen and oxygen are mixed in certain proportions, and an electric spark is passed though them, they disappear, and a quantity of water, equal in weight to the sum of their weights, appears in their place. There is not the slightest parity between the passive and active powers of the water, and those of the oxygen and hydrogen which have given rise to it. At 32 degrees Fahrenheit, and far below that temperature, oxygen and hydrogen are elastic gaseous bodies, whose particles tend to rush away from one another with great force. Water, at the same temperature, is a strong though brittle solid, whose particles tend to cohere into definite geometrical shapes, and sometimes build up frosty imitations of the most complex forms of vegetable foliage.

"Nevertheless, we call these, and many other strange phenomena, the properties of the water, and we do not hesitate to believe that, in some way or another, they result from the properties of the correspondent elements of the water. We do not assume that a something called 'aquosity' entered into and took possession of the oxide of hydrogen as soon as it was formed, and then guided the aqueous particles to their places in the facets of the crystal, or amongst the leaflets of the hoar frost. On the contrary, we live in the hope and in the faith that, by the advance of molecular physics, we shall by-and-bye be able to see our way as clearly from the constituents of water to the properties of water, as we are now able to deduce the operations of a watch from the form of its parts and the manner in which they are put together.

"Is the case in any way changed when carbonic acid, water, and ammonia disappear, and in their place, under the influence of pre-existing living protoplasm, an equivalent weight of the matter of life makes its appearance?

"It is true that there is no sort of parity between the properties of the components and the properties of the resultant, but neither was there in the case of the water. It is also true that what I have spoken of as the influence of pre-existing living matter is something quite unintelligible; but does anybody quite comprehend the *modus operandi* of an electric spark, which traverses a mixture of oxygen and hydrogen?

"What justification is there, then, for the assumption of the existence in the living matter of a something which has no representative or correlative in the not living matter, gave rise to it? What better philosophical status has 'vitality' than 'aquosity?' And why should 'vitality' hope for a better fate than the other 'itys' which have disappeared since

* Prof. Huxley, "Fortnightly Review," February, 1869.

Digitized by Google

Martinus Scriblerus accounted for the operation of the meat-jack by its inherent 'meat-roasting quality,' and scorned the 'materialism' of those who explained the turning of the spit by a certain mechanism worked by the draught of the chimney?

"If scientific language is to possess a definite and constant signification whenever it is employed, it seems to me that we are logically bound to apply to the protoplasm, or physical basis of life, the same conceptions as those which are held to be legitimate elsewhere. If the phenomena exhibited by water are its properties, so are those presented by protoplasm, living or dead, its properties. If the properties of water may be properly said to result from the nature and disposition of its component molecules, I can find no intelligible ground for refusing to say that the properties of protoplasm result from the nature and disposition of its molecules."

That the ultimate result of this is very serious, Professor Huxley does not attempt to conceal. Frankly he adds: "But I bid you beware that in accepting these conclusions, you are placing your feet on the first rung of a ladder which, in most people's estimation, is the reverse of Jacob's, and leads to the antipodes of heaven. It may seem a small thing to admit that the dull vital actions of a fungus, or a foraminifer, are the properties of their protoplasm, and are the direct results of the nature of the matter of which they are composed. But if, as I have endeavoured to prove to you, their protoplasm is essentially identical with, and most readily converted into, that of any other animal, I can discover no logical halting-place between the admission that such is the case, and the further concession that all vital action may, with equal propriety, be said to be the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm which displays it. And if so, it must be true, in the same sense, and to the same extent, that the thoughts to which I am now giving utterance, and your thoughts regarding them, are the expression of molecular changes in that matter of life which is the source of our other vital phenomena."*

In a word, of the things which Professor Huxley has spoken, this is the sum: "A nucleated mass of protoplasm turns out to be what may be termed the structural unit of the human body. As a matter of fact, the body, in its earliest state, is a mere multiple of such units; and in its perfect condition, it is a multiple of such units variously modified. . . . Protoplasm, simple or nucleated, is the formal basis of all life (and all thought). It is the clay of the potter, which, bake it and paint it as he will, remains clay, separated by artifice, and not by nature, from the commonest brick, or a sun-dried clod. Thus it becomes clear that all living powers are cognate, and that all living forms are fundamentally of one character."† And viewed thus in the light of modern scientific materialism, we may see how miserably short of the whole truth the apostle fell, though doubtless his opinion was deemed somewhat too comprehensive at the time, when he contented himself with enunciating the meagre sentiment, that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts xvii. 26); whereas he might, had his inspiration only so far enlightened him, have more grandly and universally affirmed that God 'hath made of one protoplasm all forms of animal and vegetable life for to dwell on all the face of the earth.' It is only right to add that, regarding such questions as whether

* As before. † As before.

Digitized by Google

there is any thing in the universe save matter, or what we call matter; whether there be such a being as God, or such a thing as spirit, scientific materialism knows and pretends to know nothing: it is quite content that every man should believe and fancy what he pleases. All it stipulates for is that these beliefs and fancies shall not be intruded into the sacred domain of science. Science cannot possibly recognise them; they may be very true, very good, very salutary, but they lie outside the limits of philosophical enquiry. God may be; spirits may be; angels may be; but *Protoplasm* IS.

This, to the believer in divine revelation, who holds that what the Bible distinctly affirms as matter of fact can neither be transcended nor contradicted by the actual facts of science, and that in opposition to its teaching mere scientific theorising cannot be accepted, is extremely unsatisfactory. Yet, when we repeat our question, *What is man?* to the *theological* Materialist, the answer we receive is no whit less so. Nay, we will candidly confess, that if we must needs choose between the two, we much prefer the scientific Materialist to his theological brother. The scientific Materialist, it must be admitted, is oftentimes a first-rate man of science, while the theological Materialist is always a very second-rate theologian. The former, with a far truer and more accurate acquaintance with his own special department of knowledge is, to say the least, not more positive or dogmatic than the latter; and if he somewhat profanely ignores the testimony of Scripture, he is, at all events, not guilty of mischievously perverting its meaning.

According to the *theological* Materialists, represented by the small but zealous sect, self-named the "Christadelphians," "MAN is organised dust, himself the living soul, and under the law of his nature, which is the law of sin and death, dies and perishes for ever in the dissolution of his body."* "We affirm," say they, "that man is a creature of dust formation, whose individuality and faculties are the attributes of his bodily organisation. That man, thus constituted is *mortal* (that is, subject to the law of death, or *dissolution of being*), in consequence of the disobedience of Adam, which brought death as the consequence of sin. That in the death state a man instead of having gone to another world,' is simply *a body deprived of life*, and as utterly unconscious as if he had never existed. Corruption will destroy his dead body, and he will pass away like a dream."† "Man," says Mr. Roberts, the apostle of the sect in this country, "is destitute of immortality *in every sense*. He is a mortal creature of organised substance, energised and sustained in being by power emanating from God, which he shares in common with every living thing under the sun, and which he only holds on the short average tenure of threescore years and ten, at the end of which he gives it up to him from whom he received it, and returns to the ground whence he originally came, *and his existence meanwhile is obliterated in the grave.*"‡

As scriptural proof of these grossly materialistic statements, we are referred to the narrative of man's original creation contained in the second chapter of Genesis; and also to certain expressions occurring in the books

* Dr. John Thomas, "How to Search the Scriptures for Eternal Life."
† A Declaration of the First Principles of the Oracles of the Deity," pp. 26—28.
‡ Twelve Lectures, p. 29.

Digitized by Google

of Job, Psalms, and Ecclesiastes, which seem to imply that man's conscious existence is terminated in the death of the body. In reference to the former point, we are told: "In Genesis, we are furnished with an account of the creation of man: 'And the Lord God formed man *of the dust of the ground,* and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.' (Gen. ii. 7.) Here we are informed that man was made from the ground, and that *that which was produced from the ground* was the being called MAN. 'But,' says an objector, 'it only means his body.' It is possible to say that it *means* anything we may fancy. A statement of this kind is worth nothing. There is nothing in the passage before us, nor anywhere else in the Scriptures, to indicate the popular distinction between *a man* and his body. The substantial organisation is here called man—not his body. True, he was without life before the inspiration of the breath of lives, yet he was *man.* The life was something superadded to give man living existence. The life was not the man, it was the principle; it was something outside of him, proceeding from a divine source, and infusing itself into the wonderful mechanism prepared for its reception. 'He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and MAN BECAME *a living soul.*' This is frequently quoted in proof of the common doctrine, or rather misquoted, for it is generally given, '*and breathed* INTO HIM a living soul;' but it really establishes the contrary. What became 'a living soul?' *The dust-formed being.* If, therefore, the use of the phrase, 'became a living soul,' proves the immortality and immateriality of any part of man's nature, it carries the proof to the body, for it was that which became a 'living soul.' But, of course, this would be absurd. The idea expressed in the passage before us is simple and rational, namely, that the previously inanimate being became a living being when vitalised, but not necessarily immortal, for, though a living soul, it is not said that he became an 'ever-living,' never-dying' soul."*

The superficial sophistry of such an argument as this is surely too apparent to require any serious refutation. Coolly to assert that a man's life or spirit, whatever the nature of that life or spirit may be—and we at least are not contending for its essential immortality—is no part of himself, but merely 'something superadded,' something outside of him,' evinces an audacious reliance on human credulity, which is not unworthy of a certain kind of admiration. As well might we assert that the printing of a newspaper is no part of the newspaper itself, because the sheet of paper which is printed on was made and complete before it came into the printer's hands; the printing ink being merely something impressed upon it—something outside of it. Of what, it might be triumphantly asked, is a newspaper made? Is it not of rags? And is not a newspaper, then, clearly a thing of rag-formation? And what has printing ink to do with rags? No; beyond all reasonable doubt a newspaper is a sheet of paper made of rags, which being printed becomes a *printed* newspaper, but not essentially any more a newspaper than it was before. A definition of a newspaper this, which, however satisfactory it may be to the theological Materialist, would hardly, we apprehend, be deemed so by a certain crusty old gentleman of our acquaintance, should his servant lay upon his breakfast table, in place of what he generally

* Twelve Lectures, p. 42.

Digitized by Google

finds there, a blank sheet of printing paper, and respectfully assure him that that was the newspaper, though it happened to be an unprinted one!

All that is necessarily implied in the inspired declaration that God, in the first instance, "made man of the dust of the ground," and subsequently "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," is, that the material body is the base or ultimate element of his essential nature. The statement stands in marked and fundamental contrast to all Platonic dreams of a pre-existence of human souls in a higher incorporeal condition, in which they were, and would have continued for ever, completely happy, had they not, by some heinous offence against their Creator, lost their primitive integrity and purity; and, as a punishment, been incarcerated in their present material bodies.* The inspired historian scatters this theory of heathen philosophy to the winds. Adam was made, *primarily*, "dust of the earth." Hence the penalty of death is this, that dust he is, and unto dust he must return. He had chosen to indulge the animal part of his nature, to hearken to the voice of his wife, and through her to follow instinct and not reason; hence he is condemned to share the fate of the animal. Dust he is, and unto dust he must return. Dissolution is the the law of all organic being. We have no reason to suppose the animal world before the fall to have been any exception to this law. The exception only began with man. He would have been translated had he continued sinless. He would not have seen death, but have been changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, even as Eve was taken from his side during the deep sleep into which he was cast by God. He would have passed away in a trance, in which there would have been neither pain nor penalty; mortality would have been swallowed up of life, and the corruptible would have put on incorruption. But with his transgression Adam had to take the physical as well as spiritual consequences of sin. His animal nature was degraded to the condition of the rest of the animal world; and from the day that he ate of the forbidden fruit, dying, he began to die, until he returned to the earth out of which he was first taken.†

* "Plato was just as much convinced of the life of the soul anterior to man's birth as of its immortality. He said, 'The soul, the mistress, is earlier than the body; we are no creature of earth, but of heaven.' (*Tim.* 90.) The number of souls is always a fixed and equal one; as many of them as are now in union with their body were also in existence in a previous incorporeal state. (*Rep.* x. 2, 611; *Tim.* 41.) Then, like all followers of the creed of pre-existence, he adopts the notion that, by a previous act in the earlier life, every one's character in this earthly life was determined; meaning to indicate thereby the internal dependence, the abiding and permanence introduced into the otherwise systemless course of earthly existence, delivered up as it is to change and accident, and also to expose the common error that would throw all guiltiness from itself, either upon the gods or on blind fate." . . . . . The metempsychosis which Plato taught under Orphic and Pythagorean inspiration is an essential ingredient in his theory of the world; and is therefore perpetually recurring in his more important works. He connects it with an idea, sifted and taken from popular belief, of a state of penance in Hades, though it can hardly be ascertained how large a proportion of mythical ornament or poetical conjecture he throws into the particular delineation of 'the last things,' and of transmigrations. He adopted ten grades of migration, each of a thousand years; so that the soul in each migration makes a new selection of its life-destiny, and renews its penance ten times, until it is enabled to return to an incorporeal existence with God, and to the pure contemplation of him in an ideal world."—DOLLINGER: "*The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ.*" pp. 316—320, vol. I.

† REV. J. B. HEARD: "The Tripartite Nature of Man; Spirit, Soul, and Body." The most important and satisfactory work of its class England has yet produced.

Digitized by Google

As regards that class of Old Testament expressions which appear to intimate that man has no conscious, in point of fact no real existence apart from the material body, which, as we have just seen, it is contended *is the man;* we are assured by Mr. Roberts, "All Bible allusion to the subject of death is as unlike modern sentiment as it is possible to conceive. The Bible speaks of death as the *extinction of life,* and never as the commencement of another state. *Not once* does it tell of a dead man having gone to heaven. Not once, except by an allowable poetical figure (Isa. xiv. 4), are the dead represented as conscious. They are always pictured in language that accords with experience—always spoken of as in the land of darkness, and silence, and unconsciousness. Solomon says, 'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for *there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom* IN THE GRAVE *whither thou goest.*' (Eccl. ix. 10.) Job, in the anguish of accumulated calamity, cursed the day of his birth, and wished he had died when an infant; and mark what he says would have been the consequence; 'For now I should have *lain still and been quiet; I should have slept; then had I been at rest* with kings and counsellors of the earth, which *built desolate places* (tombs) for themselves; or with princes that had gold, who filled their houses with silver; or *as an hidden untimely birth* I HAD NOT BEEN; *as infants which never saw the light;* there the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest. There the prisoners rest together, they hear not the voice of the oppressor; the small and the great are there, and the servant is free from his master.' (Job iii. 13—19.) He also makes the following unequivocal statement, which ought to be well considered by those who believe that babies go to heaven when they die: 'Wherefore hast thou brought me out of the womb? O that I had *given up the ghost,* and no eye had seen me; *I should have been* AS THOUGH I HAD NOT BEEN.' (x. 18.) David incidentally alludes to the state of the dead in the following impressive words: 'Free among the dead, like the slain that lie in the grave, *whom thou rememberest no more,* and they are cut off from thy hand. . . . . Wilt thou show thy wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the *grave,* or thy faithfulness *in destruction?* Shall thy wonders be known *in the dark,* and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?' These questions are answered in a short but emphatic statement which occurs in the hundred and fifteenth Psalm, verse 17: 'The DEAD praise NOT *the Lord, neither* ANY *that go down into silence.*' And the Psalmist gives pathetic expression to his own view of man's evanescent nature in the following words, which have a direct bearing on the state of the dead: 'Behold thou hast made my days as an handbreadth, and mine age is as nothing before thee. *Verily, every man at his best state is altogether vanity.* . . . . . Hear my prayer, O Lord, and give ear unto my cry; hold not thy peace at my tears: for I am a stranger with thee, and a sojourner as all my fathers were. O spare me, that I may recover my strength *before I go hence* and BE NO MORE.' (Psa. xxxix. 5, 12, 13.) He says in Psalm cxlvi. 2: '*While I live* I will praise the Lord; I will sing praises unto my God WHILE I HAVE ANY BEING;' clearly implying, that in David's view, his being would cease with the occurrence of death. In addition to these general indications of the destructive nature of death, as *a deprivation of being,* there are other statements in the Scripture which specifically deny that the dead have any

Digitized by Google

consciousness. For instance, Solomon says (Eccl. ix. 5, 6): 'The living know that they shall die; but THE DEAD KNOW NOT ANYTHING, neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten; also their *love*, and their *hatred*, and their *envy are now* PERISHED, neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun.' How often we hear the remark concerning the dead, 'Ah, well! he knows all now.' Now, this remark is either true or not true. If Solomon's words have any meaning it is the very opposite of true; for he says, '*The dead know not* ANYTHING.' How common again it is for religious teachers to say that, after death the *dead* will love and serve God with greater devotion in heaven, because freed from the clog of this mortal body, or curse him with more fiendish ferocity in hell, for the same reason; that in fact their love will be perfected, and their hate intensified, in the very face of Solomon's declaration to the contrary. 'Their *love*, and their *hatred*, and their *envy* are now PERISHED.' David is equally decided on this point. He says (Psa. cxlvi. 3, 4): 'Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help; for his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, *and in that very day* HIS THOUGHTS PERISH.' Again, he says (Psa. vi. 5): '*In death* THERE IS NO REMEMBRANCE OF THEE, in the grave *who shall give thee thanks*?' Hezekiah, king of Israel, gives similar testimony. He had been 'sick, nigh unto death;' and on his recovery, he indicated a song of praise to God, in which he gives the following reason for thanksgiving: 'For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee, *they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living,* THE LIVING, *he* shall praise thee as I do this day.' (Isa. xxxviii. 18, 19.) This host of Scripture testimony is conclusive. It decisively settles the point against all philosophical speculation. It shows that death is a total eclipse of being—a complete obliteration of our conscious selves from God's universe."*

These passages the theological Materialist is never tired of quoting in book, and pamphlet, and tract; we meet with them in wearisome reiteration, and cited in the apparently triumphant assurance that they settle the matter beyond all possibility of question. Yet a moment's candid examination may suffice to convince us that this class of texts either fail by proving too much, or else in reality prove nothing in reference to the point in question. If we accept them as statements not only *recorded* by inspiration, but *given* by inspiration; or, in other words, as expressing not simply the thoughts of the men who uttered them, but the thoughts of the Holy Spirit, by whose inspiration they have been left on record for our instruction, then indeed they will serve not only to prove that man's existence is interrupted by the death of the body, but further, that it is thereby actually and for ever terminated. David, for instance, in one of the passages quoted by Mr. Roberts, does not only ask, "Wilt thou show thy wonders to the dead?" but adds, "*Shall the dead arise* and praise thee?" So again, we find Job giving utterance to such language as this: "There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease; though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground; yet through the scent of water it will bud, and bring forth boughs like a plant. But

* Twelve Lectures, pp. 48—50.

Digitized by Google

man dieth and wasteth away: yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up: so man lieth down, *and riseth not; till the heavens be no more they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep.*" (Job xiv. 7—12.) The words, "till the heavens be no more" being by no means intended to imply that *when* the heavens pass away the dead *shall* "awake and be raised out of their sleep," but are rather used as equivalent to 'never!' the heavens being recognised by the Jews and the ancients generally as the very emblem of immutability and eternity.* In like manner Isaiah says of the wicked: "They are dead, *they shall not live;* they are deceased, *they shall not rise;* therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish." (Isai. xxvi. 14.) What shall we say then? Does the Bible indeed teach that death is an eternal sleep, and that for man, even as for the beasts that perish, there is no existence beyond the grave? If so, we may as well lay the old book aside, and with Paul adopt the Epicurean maxim, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." (1 Cor. xv. 32.) But no; let us rather conclude that what the passages referred to really prove is this—and only this—that though the saints of the old dispensation doubtless possessed a hope of the future state and the resurrection from among the dead, it was yet a hope which they were able to realise only in their best moments. The light was dim, though real, and sometimes seemed to go out altogether. But for us, as Christians, a brighter and steadier light now shineth. Christ has "abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." (2 Tim. i. 10.) And hence the very significant circumstance, conveniently ignored by the Christadelphian, that not only is it impossible to adduce a single passage of a like character from the New Testament; but that, on the contrary, we have in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus the scene of which is laid in Hades, in the apostle Paul's declaration, that for the believer "to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord" (2 Cor. v. 8); in our Lord's gracious words to the dying thief—"*To-day* shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke xxiii. 43); and last, but not least, in the mysterious fact that, during the interval between his death and resurrection, Christ "went and preached unto the spirits (surely existing and conscious spirits) in prison, which were once disobedient, when the long-suffering of God was waiting in the days of Noah." (1 Pet. iii. 19, 20.) In all these contrasted passages, we say, there is very sufficient proof afforded us that the intermediate state is indeed one of consciousness. Yes; the fair flower of Hope does in truth bloom on the grave since Jesus burst its bonds, and rose "the first-fruits of them that sleep;" and a gracious light has illuminated the darkness of Hades since Jesus thus descended into it, preaching the gospel to the dead (1 Peter iv. 6), and wresting from "him that had the power of death" its awful keys.

But we must not enlarge. To state as briefly as possible a few of our most decisive objections to the answer given to our question, *What is man?* by the theological Materialist, we may observe:—

* Thus in Psalm lxxxix., in language evidently Messianic, we read: "His seed will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven." And our Lord himself says (Matt. v. 18): "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled"—that is to say, neither jot nor tittle shall *ever* pass.

Digitized by Google

1. First, that *the theory is essentially* ATHEISTIC. This, we are quite aware, may be regarded as a hard saying; and we would not for a moment be supposed to imply that all theological Materialists are Atheists. We speak not of persons holding the theory, but of the practical and logical tendency of the theory itself. That many who hold it are better than their creed we thankfully believe; but at the same time of this we are solemnly persuaded—that from no soul to no devil—from no devil to no Holy Ghost—from no Holy Ghost to no divinity of Christ—from no divinity of Christ to *no God*—is but a series of steps in the descent of which it is hard to stop. And it is an awful and alarming fact that by those who fully accept Mr. Robert's views every one of these steps has been taken save the last—*if we may even except that.* Yes, we repeat the statement, 'if we may even except that,' because there is in the volume from which we have been quoting, one truly portentous passage which renders it doubtful. "It is," says Mr. Roberts, "only an arbitrary system of thought that has created the distinctions (between matter and mind), implied in the terms of metaphysics. Nature—that is, universal existence—is *one.* It is the elaboration of one primitive power. It is not made up of two antagonistic and incompatible elements. God is the source of all. In him, everything exists; out of him, everything is evolved. *Different elements and substances are but different forms of the same eternal essence or first cause*—described in the Bible as '*spirit*,' *which God is; and in scientific language as electricity.*"* If we at all understand the last sentence which we have italicised, it surely means that God is "that eternal essence or first cause" which the Bible calls 'spirit' but which science knows as 'electricity'! In the words of another, that "*electricity is God, and God is electricity!*" And, if this be indeed his true meaning, then, by Mr. Roberts at least, *the last step has been taken,* and the most tremendous question which can be suggested to the mind of man—"Is it HE, or is it IT?" has been answered by him in a sense which denies the personal conscious existence of Jehovah. But it will doubtless be said, for this fearful statement Mr. Roberts alone is responsible, and it is unfair and unjust to charge it against theological Materialists in general. It is necessary, therefore, that we should in a few words point out that this is after all only the fair outcome of the theory itself. We are told, not by Mr. Roberts alone, but by all who agree with him on the question of man's essential constitution, that we have and can have no experience of the existence of mind or spirit, except as a property exhibited by and inherent in matter. But is this so in reality? The answer to this question, often given, has been so clearly and succinctly stated by the learned author of '*The Physical History of Man*,' that we cannot do better than repeat his own words: "The whole universe displays the most striking proofs of the existence and operation of intellect, or mind, in a state separate from organisation, and under conditions which preclude all reference to organisation. There is, therefore, at least one being or substance of that nature which we call mind separate from organised body, not only somewhere but everywhere."† "However immeasurable," adds Sir Benjamin Brodie, after quoting these words, "the distance may be

* Twelve Lectures, p. 31.
† Pritchard on Nervous Diseases, Introduction.

Digitized by Google

between the mightiest intellect of man and that of the Deity, it must be admitted that they belong to the same mode of existence: and I do not understand how any one who believes in the existence of a Deity can receive without hesitation the doctrine that any kind of mind can be nothing more than the result of a peculiar arrangement of the molecules of matter."* But in truth it needs little argument to prove that to deny also the existence of 'spirit' as such, is in effect to deny also the existence of him who "is a spirit" (John iv. 24), and as such "the Father of our spirits." (Heb. xii. 9.) For as the apostle Paul argues in his celebrated discourse on the resurrection, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen," that is to say, if the rising of the dead be, *per se*, a thing impossible, then plainly an individual instance of such resurrection (*i.e.*, Christ's) must be equally impossible. Even so we may argue in the present instance, if the existence of 'spirit' be, *per se*, a thing incredible, then, since every general law must include every particular instance, the existence of A SPIRIT (*i.e.*, God), must also be incredible, and thus we are landed in blank Atheism.

2. Our second objection to the theory of theological Materialism is, that it manifestly *contravenes the instinctive convictions of humanity*. Among the various arguments urged in support of the Platonic dream of the essential deathlessness of the human soul, few have been more frequently adduced, or more confidently relied on, than this—that it was the universal belief of all nations. An assertion this utterly untrue in the sense intended; and an argument utterly worthless in reference to the question of man's *immortality* (properly so called); yet having, like most other errors a basis of truth, the fact, namely, that mankind have universally believed in some future state of existence, for man immediately succeeding that which he at present possesses. Now the universality of this belief implies its intuitive character, yet it is a belief which rests entirely on the assumption that the soul is an entity capable of a conscious existence apart from man's present material organisation. Hence, as a recent writer has truly observed, "One of the leading positions which seem to be established by the historical statements and details of philosophy in all countries and ages, is that mind and matter are two separate and distinct things. The whole current of speculation scarcely furnishes us with anything approaching to a single complete theory, which, in all its aspects, and in all its logical deductions, points to an opposite principle. The mind of man, in every state of existence of which we have any authentic records, has always been struggling to give utterance to this fundamental truth, or manifestation of its inward consciousness. It assumes, it is true, a variety of appearances, but it constantly retains the unity of its character intact. From the banks of the Thames to the banks of the Ganges; from the first mutterings of science in the East, to the finished philosophical productions of the present hour; this truth has never ceased its influence over the minds of countless millions of our race, who have passed through life under external circumstances and with speculative theories infinitely varied. Here there is a solemn unity of universal assent, which no hardihood of assertion can deny, nor captious sophistry gainsay."† And, we may surely add,

* Psychological Inquiries, Part II. pp. 210, 211.

† Blakey's "History of the Philosophy of Mind," vol. I. Introduction.

Digitized by Google

being found in irreconcileable antagonism with which, the theory of the Materialist is at once convicted of untruthfulness.

3. It is further to be objected against this theory, that while it professedly recognises, and even magnifies the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; making "immortality a conditional gift to be bestowed only at the resurrection;" it at the same time *renders a true and proper resurrection an impossibility* by destroying the real ground of personal identity: thus *de facto* establishing the utter extinction of man's being at death, and consequently undermining the only solid basis of all religion and morality. For, plainly, if the resurrection is anything better than a delusion and a lie, it must be a resurrection of those very persons who have previously lived and died. In other words, those who are raised from the grave must be *personally identical* with those laid in the grave. The creating anew persons materially, mentally, and morally identical being a *reproduction*, indeed, but in no true sense a *resurrection*. To illustrate this, two acorns alike to an atom, laid side by side cannot be the same; nor are they any more so if put successively in the very same place; nor, again, if one be destroyed and replaced by the other. *Unbroken continuity of existence* is the *sine quâ non* of actual identity. A persistent substance, distinct from and underlying all changes of constitution and all degrees of consciousness, is that apart from which personal identity cannot exist. It is the abiding thread which being once snapped can never be reunited. On this point, that acute theologian, Bishop Bull, has observed: "The Sadducees believed that there is a God, though whether they believed God himself to be incorporeal is, not without very great reason, questioned by some. But this is certain, that besides God, they believed nothing at all to subsist, but what is perceptible to sense (Acts xxiii. 8). And hence they denied angels to be permanent substances, believing the angels of whom they had read in Scripture to be only certain phantasms, occasionally formed by God, when he would at any time reveal his will to the sons of men, and afterwards vanishing and disappearing. And agreeably to the hypothesis, they denied also any such beings as the spirits of men, distinct substances from their bodies, and able to subsist without them. And hence, farther, by a necessary chain of consequences, they denied the resurrection of the bodies of men after death. For, to what purpose should the body of man arise, if there were no soul in being, to which it should be reunited, and by which it should be again informed? And how could the same man at the resurrection receive the reward of his past actions, as the Pharisees rightly taught, if his soul did not subsist after death? For every man hath his individualation chiefly from his soul. . . . . If, therefore, the soul of man itself be extinguished at death, at the raising of our dust, a new soul must be produced by God for every man, and so every man would be another man, and the same man could not receive the rewards and punishments of the world to come, due to their respective actions done in this life, which is the only supposed end of the resurrection. This a learned man more scholastically expresseth in these words: 'If the soul be not a permanent substance, but only a quality or crasis, which when the body dies perisheth and is extinguished with it, it is impossible that the same numerical man should rise after death; because the former soul perished, cannot be numerically the same with the form or soul which is restored. For it is numerically another, because between

Digitized by Google

that which perished, and this which is restored, there intervened nonentity. Now whensoever between two extremes a medium of a diverse kind is interposed, these two cannot be the same numerically, though they may be the same specifically. For that is numerically one, which is continued in one common term; as that is one line, which is not cut off or interrupted, and that one motion, which is not discontinued by rest. But there is no common term between that which once was and perished, and that which afterwards is produced; for non-existence came between them, and therefore they cannot be numerically the same.' Vain, therefore, would be the expectation of good men, because they themselves should not be rewarded in the resurrection, but others for them."*

4. Lastly, the Materialist's theory is manifestly opposed to *the testimony of Scripture*. This we have already shown in reference to the general tenor of New Testament language. There is, however, one passage which suggests an argument of such force that we have never seen an attempt made to meet it fairly. We refer to our Lord's solemn, and in its bearing on several important doctrines, momentous declaration in Matt. x. 28, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Who does not see that if the soul of man has a necessary dependence on the body; if, in other words, the soul is not in itself an entity, but simply the result of man's material organisation, so that when the organism is destroyed the soul which animated it of necessity ceases to exist, it must inevitably follow that he who kills the body does with the very same stroke, murder the soul also? Yet, in the words just quoted, the Saviour has solemnly assured us that for us to kill the soul is an impossibility. Men may indeed destroy the body, they may even consume it to ashes and scatter those ashes to the winds of heaven, but they "are not able to kill the soul:" *it* still eludes their cruel rage; *it* still continues to exist—consciously to exist, or it would be but a dead soul—even after the body has been reduced to its component elements. If, therefore, this declaration be true—and who that names the name of Christ will dare to doubt it? then plainly Materialism, even in its most Christian form, is false. Nor will it avail to say that Christ speaks here only of the final and utter destruction of the soul, which man is unable to effect inasmuch as God has promised a resurrection to life again. This may be seen in a moment to be but a poor and palpable evasion of the natural meaning of the words, since *in the very same sense* the Saviour might have declared that it was not within any man's power to kill the body of another—that is utterly and for ever—inasmuch as God will raise it up also at the last day. But in direct opposition to this our Lord has admitted man's power to kill the body in the very same sense in which he has denied his power to kill the soul, and consequently he cannot possibly be supposed to speak here with any reference to the resurrection. This passage then, and the argument which is founded upon it (originally advanced, we believe, by Bishop Bull), we commend to the earnest and candid attention of the theological Materialist. Let him not attempt simply to evade it, let him remember with due reverence *by whom* the solemn words were spoken; and if he sees, as surely he must see, unless the will be wanting, that they and his theory

* Works, vol. I. pp. 35—37.

Digitized by Google

cannot both stand, may he have the grace to say—Let the words of Christ be true, though every human theory perish.

And here for the present we must pause, hoping on a future occasion to lay before the reader the answers returned to our great question, *What is man?* by those whom we shall designate respectively the *Immaterialist* and the *Bible Psychologist.*

Birkenhead. W. MAUDE.

Literature.

The Glory of Christ in the Creation and Reconciliation of all Things. With special reference to the Doctrine of Eternal Evil. A course of Sermons preached at Eaton Chapel, Eaton Square, London. By SAMUEL MINTON, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford. Second Edition. London: LONGMAN, GREEN & Co.

IT says something for the deep interest awakened by the question to which this book is devoted, that it has so soon reached a second edition, notwithstanding the determined opposition of certain reviewers. "It was easy to foresee," says Mr. Minton, "that this book would receive little favour from the religious press. The amount of hostile criticism is neither more nor less than I expected. The 'Orthodox' have attacked it for its 'heresy' on one point; the 'Liberals' for its orthodoxy on other points. Besides, nearly all the organs of theological thought in this country are Platonist in their belief that the human soul is indestructible. They differ widely amongst themselves as to the conditions of eternal life hereafter in certain cases; some following Origen in the belief that all will ultimately be restored to the favour of God; others holding with Augustine that those who are impenitent will live for ever in a state of sin and misery. But they agree in rejecting the revealed truth, so humbling to human pride, namely, that man is mortal, and fleeth away like a shadow, that the Creator himself 'only hath immortality,' that in Christ alone can anything permanently consist, that only they who eat of the bread which he gives will live for ever, and that all moral creatures, on whom the wrath of God abideth with its whole force, must, sooner or later, 'fail before him,' be crushed out of existence, and 'perish everlastingly.' Naturally, therefore, they join in condemning the doctrine here advocated."

Those who challenge a dogma which has for ages been interwoven with theology, must lay their account with violent attacks from the guardians of orthodoxy, even though it can be proved that the dogma in question is contrary at once to the character of God, the nature of man, and the teaching of Scripture. Mr. Minton knew beforehand that he would have to pay a heavy price for his doctrine, that sin and suffering are not to be eternal, and that only in the divine Saviour can any human being enjoy the priceless blessing of immortality. He has paid that price like a brave Christian man; he has survived the storm that burst upon his head; in fact he does not appear much the worse for it; and in this volume he deals with his opponents in a manner which shows the scholar and the gentleman as master of the situation. The argument of the book is simply conclusive. Unless a man is determined, all evidence to the contrary notwithstanding, to believe in the appalling doctrine that human creatures are to be tormented in fire for ever and ever, Mr. Minton's admirable volume will settle the controversy.

As we are passing through an ordeal of misrepresentation, intolerance, and desertion, similar to that experienced by Mr. Minton, we can fully and deeply sympathize with him; and we thank

Digitized by Google

him very cordially for the sympathy he has expressed towards us. We quote a paragraph from the appendix: "Mr. Grant closes his first chapter in so kindly, and even complimentary, a tone towards myself, that hostile criticism is almost disarmed. Yet it would be ungenerous to Dr. Leask, who has incurred such sacrifices for the truth's sake, if I were to pass over in silence the unwarranted attack which is made upon him in the last volume. It is precisely the same as that made upon me in the former volume. Persons of Mr. Grant's temperament seem to think it a necessary part of common honesty that, whenever a doubt arises in any one's mind, it should be at once proclaimed to the world. That neither Dr. Leask, nor myself, acted on such a principle, is the whole gravamen of our opponent's furious assaults upon us. It may be necessary to inform him that, after a view has been long under consideration, it is not always easy to know the precise moment when it becomes sufficiently matured to justify its publication. It is often something which looks like a mere accident that, at last, to borrow Mr. Grant's mild language, 'tears the mask from the face.' For myself, I am thankful to feel perfectly satisfied with the crisis, when I was enabled to see the truth distinctly, and to proclaim it fearlessly. For Dr. Leask, I have his own assurance that, during the greater portion of the time referred to, it would not have been easy for him to preach 'his universalist or annihilationist creed' (which Mr. Grant seems unable to distinguish), inasmuch as he was then a 'blind follower of the blind,' in believing the popular creed."

Near, even at the Doors. By A LAYMAN. London: E. Marlborough & Co.

UNDER this somewhat misleading title, "*a Layman*" gives us a revision of the authorised version of the Book of Revelation, arbitrarily divided into the "*Writing on the Back*," and the "*Writing Within*," the former being printed on the left-hand pages, the latter on the right hand pages. Brief notes, on the year-day theory, being added throughout. As regards the text given, in which we are principally interested, we notice some decided improvements on the A.V.; as for instance, (iv. 6—9.) "Living creatures," instead of "beasts," which we much prefer to Dean Alford's "beings." The revision, however, is by no means thorough, as *e.g.*, we have (xxii. 19,) the common reading, "God shall take away his part out of the book of life," which has no MSS. authority whatever; it should be, "God shall take away his part out of *the tree of life*."

Ezra, the Last Prophet; or, the Vision of the Great Twelve-winged, Three-Headed Eagle, with Twenty Imperial Feathers, Fulfilled. By T. INMAN, B.A. London: W. Macintosh.

PERHAPS the greatest service to the cause of prophetic truth, and the truest help towards disarming the prejudice with which the whole subject is regarded even by good men, which a majority of writers on Prophecy could render, would be *to write no more*. This seems no doubt a harsh saying; yet it cannot be denied that the crude, wild, ill-digested publications which have issued from the press during the last thirty years, have done much to create and to perpetuate the prejudice we so much lament. It is with regret that we must add the present pamphlet to the list. The writer of it attempts to prove (1) that the Apocryphal Second Book of Esdras is "the genuine work of the inspired writer Ezra;" and (2) that "the vision of the great eagle is an inspired prediction of the history of Rome and the Roman world down to the present time." He fails, however, to prove either point to our satisfaction.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

OCTOBER 1, 1869.

VERY IMPORTANT.

TO THE READERS OF THE RAINBOW.

CHRISTIAN Friends! Shall the *Rainbow* cease to exist at the close of the present year, or will you by generous contributions to its cost during the next few months enable the Editor to continue his earnest testimony to glorious truths, should life be spared? He trusts the deep importance of the subject will be a sufficient excuse for his earnestness in the matter, and a sufficient apology for a plain statement of facts which otherwise would not have seen the light.

It is now nearly six years since the first number of this magazine was published. It was undertaken from a solemn conviction that certain momentous truths of Scripture had either ceased to exercise their proper influence in modern theology, or had altogether disappeared from what is usually understood by orthodox religious literature. Time and facts have only strengthened that conviction; and it is absolutely certain that at the present moment, considering the distracted state of Christendom, a journal which owes no allegiance to any church or party, as such, but accepts the word of God as its creed, and reverently lays all the sanctified intelligence it can command at the feet of the Lord Jesus Christ, *ought* to be prized and heartily sustained by all who feel that the only hope of the church is the second coming of her glorious Head, and the only hope of the world the return of its rightful King. Persistently and in many forms, with argument and proof unanswered and unanswerable, the *Rainbow* has taught this from the first number until now. It has done this in the face of opposition, misrepresentation, and obloquy; and under a constant load of care pressing on the mind of the Editor, who from the first hour until now, has had the entire pecuniary as well as literary responsibility of a work, which from its

Digitized by Google

very nature can never become a commercial success. The *Rainbow* speaks to the thoughtful and the devout; and though we should have been grateful had there been a margin of profit to enable us to testify more adequately our appreciation of the labours of able brethren who have been our fellow workers, yet we felt certain from the beginning that a 'popular,' in other words a paying journal, the *Rainbow* was not likely to become. By the generosity of a valued Christian brother its first expenses were met; and by occasional help from other Christian friends it has been carried on, with the sincere desire to render some service to the church amidst her manifold perplexities. To all who have helped, from the gift of a few postage stamps upward, we this day render once more our most cordial thanks. If they had any idea of the number of letters that have reached us expressing gratitude to God for the teachings of the *Rainbow*, they would feel that their co-operation has been richly rewarded.

But a few months ago, at the bidding of conscience and in the fear and love of God, we did a thing which greatly offended many of our old friends. They have deserted us because the great truth, after years of earnest study, has come like the light of a glorious sun upon our mind, that there is no immortality out of Christ, and that therefore the dogma of endless torment to the unsaved is not, and cannot be, true. Hundreds—thousands of persons have thanked us for the existence of the *Rainbow;* shall its services be dispensed with *now* that its value as an exponent of Scripture is so greatly enhanced? Shall it disappear because certain Christian men, hitherto its supporters, have not yet seen what they will as certainly see some day, as that to-morrow's sun will rise, that the punishment of the ungodly is "everlasting destruction"? Shall its testimony be silenced because its editor has with conscious loyalty and love to God, lifted up his voice against a dogma that fearfully dishonours him whose wondrous name is Love, and shocks and horrifies every man that *tries to think what it really means?*

I might make this case still stronger by mentioning the fact that, though a poor man, I have laboured gratuitously these six years, having no editorial fee; that in teaching the doctrine of life in Christ only, I am at one with prophets, and apostles, and the Lord of both; that in declaring that the wicked shall be consumed, I am wresting out of the hands of infidelity its very strongest weapon; that I only ask co-operation from men who love the Lord in endeavouring to serve my generation according to the will of God; and that willing service for the truth's sake seems at least to deserve some appreciation on the part of those who love the truth.

The day may come when those who have turned against me will think better of it. I know they are estimable men, and I regard them as highly as before, although their opinion is no rule for my faith, and their defection

Digitized by Google

from a magazine they once admired, no reason why I should abandon what I consider an imperative Christian duty. The letters they sent me have all been destroyed to prevent the possibility of any of them seeing the light when this hand shall cease to write. Perhaps for this thoughtful service, too, some of them may yet feel grateful.

It may, however, encourage the reader if I give two or three specimens of letters from men who think the value of the *Rainbow* increased since the great question of immortality was introduced into its pages.

A gentleman in London writes :—

"Thanks many, dear Dr. Leask, for the glorious light you have shed upon a perplexing mystery. I live in a new universe now, and I love God as I never did before."

A gentleman in Scotland says :—

"I trust the Lord will sustain you in the arduous and glorious work in which you are engaged, clearing away the mystification with which traditional, and what is termed orthodox theology have overlaid the prophetic parts of Scripture, and setting forth the truth in its pure simplicity to the edification and joy of humble believers."

Another says, among other things :—

"Accept my warmest thanks that you have opened the *Rainbow* for the purpose of bringing to light the doctrine of immortality only in Christ. I must confess myself won over to the scriptural arguments brought forward."

A gentleman in Barnet writes :—

"Dear Sir—I can scarcely express the thankfulness (and also that of many friends to whom your valuable magazine is a never-failing source of pleasure and profit) with which I read the article on 'Immortality,' and the many others which it has called forth, having long since felt that the doctrine of 'Eternal *Torment*,' is inconsistent with every attribute of God, particularly those of *justice* and love, and for the holding of which his word holds out no fair warrant. I sincerely regret that the number of subscribers to the *Rainbow* is so limited, but I am sure God will not forget your work and labour of love; and I pray God to stir up his people, that they may realise the vast importance of the truth it advocates, and that they may thus be led to put forth greater efforts to make it known. I can testify to the great benefit I have personally received from it, and lose no opportunity of bringing it under the notice of my friends, many of whom now take it in regularly."

A clergyman of eminent ability writes :—

"Increasingly precious to me and several of my friends are the contents of the *Rainbow*, and let me add, greatly enhanced is my affectionate esteem for its Editor. There are not a few old-fashioned ideas from which we

Digitized by Google

require to be disestablished and disendowed, that our preaching and thinking may be free and pure, because more scriptural and less conventional. I have always felt a repugnance to the eternity of penal torments, that it was unwarranted, even by the *exceeding sinfulness* of sin; but, especially, do I feel that the *gift* of immortality, which was never inherent in man, is the blessed prerogative of Jesus. This, I feel, honours the Son with his due honour."

A gentlemen in Dundee writes:—

"Permit a stranger to express his thanks to you for the noble and fearless manner in which you have of late opened your columns for the discussion of the great themes of immortality, and of the fate of the wicked. Though, for the moment, it may militate against you, yet I do not think it will do so long. If some cease their patronage in a fit of anger at seeing their monstrous dogma of endless torments assailed—the most detestable and God-insulting of all heresies that ever yet were vamped up—never mind it, but go courageously forward in the path of duty, as you have done hitherto, and, doubtless, many new friends will be raised up to take the place of those lost. For there are many whose minds are being stirred up to thoughtful enquiry on these solemn topics, and whose research will increase the tide of disgust that is rising against these corrupt sectarian theologies, and will one day sweep them away. Such periodicals as yours will serve a most beneficent end, in showing many enquirers after truth—'the right way,' into which they should turn, and thus save them from *infidelity*, or from its half sister, *indifferentism*, as in the case of 'C. T., Liverpool,' on cover of July number. Do not be discouraged, then, dear sir, but fling your banner to the breeze, and fight manfully the battles of the Lord, *and he will sustain you.*"

Christian brethren and sisters, I need say no more. The case is in you hands. Will you heartily sustain the *Rainbow* by sending me donations for the purpose, before the close of the present year? If you do, my path of duty will be clear, and our mutual service in the cause of truth, under our FATHER'S blessing, may be highly honoured in honouring him. If you do not see it a duty and a privilege thus to respond, my path will be equally clear, although to bid farewell to the *Rainbow* and its readers will be exceedingly painful—*a trial I would fain be spared.*

Digitized by Google

THE TRANSLATION OF THE SAINTS.

ADMITTING the doctrine of the Translation of the Saints—both "quick and dead"—at the approaching advent of the great Bridegroom, a question of intense and absorbing interest arises, namely, "Of whom will that blessed company be composed? Will it embrace *all* who have, or had whilst in the flesh, the grace of God in their hearts, as symbolised by the 'oil' in the 'vessels' of the wise virgins? Or, will it consist of an election only out of the whole body of those, all of whom are 'elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ,' *i.e.*, of an election out of an election? of those only, in brief, who, like Enoch, are pre-eminent in holiness and good works?"

Mr. Maude, in his highly interesting paper on 'Enoch a type of the translated saints,' in the *Rainbow* for September, 1868,* has adopted the latter supposition, and maintained it with his wonted ability. But it appears to us that this 'elective doctrine' (as for brevity we shall term it throughout this paper) is in the first place most *discouraging;* and in the second most *dangerous*, as well as *unscriptural.*

We shall now proceed to give our reasons for this strong opinion as concisely as we can, studying simplicity as well as brevity, and remembering that we are writing for the "babes" in Christ, unto whom are revealed those divine mysteries which are hidden from "the wise and prudent." We are more and more persuaded every day that the truths of Scripture—all at least which concern the peace of God's saints (as this question does most intimately)—*lie upon its surface,* and are most easily discernible by those who most habitually cultivate a child-like spirit. To what profound depths of error has not the opposite spirit led even the best of men! In what mazes of perplexity has not the habit of suspecting a mystic sense even in the plainest texts involved them! How, for example, has that good man Mr. Birks been led, by that fatal leaning to *mysticism* so common among the learned, to publish such gross absurdities as, his able reviewer† justly says, perhaps never before issued from the brain of any one 'out of Bedlam'! What a mournful warning to beware of "philosophy and vain deceit"‡ does not his work on 'The Victory of Divine Goodness' convey to

* Some apology or explanation may justly be expected from the writer for allowing so long a time to elapse before noticing the above-mentioned essay. He can only say that immediately on its perusal he proceeded to draw up a sketch of the following paper. But incessant calls of business, as well as long continued ill-health intervened to hinder its completion until the present moment. The same causes may perhaps also plead his excuse in case he should have, inadvertently, gone over the same ground other writers in the *Rainbow* may have taken in reply to Mr. Maude—never being able to do more than read one or two articles, now and then. He can only say that he is not aware of any other writer having advanced the same views and arguments.

† The Rev. H. Constable. ‡ Col. ii. 8.

Digitized by Google

all interpreters of God's word—a work whose positions would be ludicrous in the extreme if they were not so tremendously awful, and which *even so* must provoke a smile on any reader of sane and healthy mind! O let us all beware of 'mysticism'—that subtle poison of the mind—and be content to sit as little children at the feet of Jesus; to become 'babes' that we may be truly wise!

Approaching now our present subject in that child-like spirit, and discarding all mystic and recondite theories and baseless imaginations,* we say—

I. First, that the "elective doctrine," as maintained by Mr. Maude, is *most discouraging* to the true disciple of the Lord Jesus, and the truer he is—the closer he may be copying the meek and lowly spirit of his divine Master—the more discouraging must it prove. It is obviously and evidently so much so as to send an immediate chill through the heart! For, if those only are to participate in that exalted destiny who are pre-eminent in holiness and good works, who then could dare to indulge even the faintest hope of being found amongst the number? Who would venture to esteem himself worthy of so great an honour? With what feelings, therefore, must the true Christian (and the truest are ever those who have the lowliest thought of themselves) look forward to the advent of the great Bridegroom? Surely not with exultation, not with joy, not with longing desire—as the Scriptures everywhere and *indiscriminately* exhort the saints to anticipate that event—but with feelings of deepest depression and despondency! Such a one would reason thus, and we see not how the justice of his reasoning could be denied: "None but those pre-eminent in holiness and good works shall enter with the Bridegroom into the 'marriage supper.' I, therefore, at all events must be excluded. The 'outer darkness' must be *my portion*, whatever may be that of others. Alas! for all my hopes are perished in a moment! They have vanished like the transient sunshine of a winter's day; and dark clouds of fear and terror have overshadowed my soul! I *had* cherished the entrancing hope that at the coming of our dear Lord and Master, a "crown of righteousness"—small it might be and of but dim radiance, yet still a crown—was "reserved" not only for pre-eminently holy Paul, but for "all them that love his appearing." I am conscious to

* Allusion is here made to the inferences of the above-mentioned Essayist from the "reserve with which Enoch is spoken of in Scripture." This is dangerous ground—bordering closely on "mysticism." If such "fanciful" deductions may be drawn from the "reserve" of Scripture, where are we to stop? What is to be the limit over which human *fancy*—a most elastic faculty!—may not pass? If, for example, the inferences of the Essayist from the "reserve" respecting Enoch be just, may not another writer, with equal authority, build his theories upon the still greater "reserve" of Scripture as to his father Methuselah? or any other Scripture character of whom little is said? The inferences themselves may be true, or they may not; but assuredly the *silence* of Scripture is slender ground on which to build *any* theory, "fainciful," or not!

Digitized by Google

myself that *I did* so "love his appearing." It has been hitherto my dearest hope by day, animating my feeble efforts in the Lord's vineyard, and strengthening me against the wiles of the devil. It was my sweet dream by night (alas! that it should have proved but a dream!) that when he 'who is our life' should 'descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God,' that I also, though the meanest of his servants, the 'last of the least of all saints,' should be of those who shall be caught up to 'meet the Lord in the air,' to be 'for ever with the Lord;' and that when he in the fulness of time shall come with 'the armies of heaven,' I also should 'appear with him in glory.' Not so, however, as it now appears, but to me—should I then be amongst the living—will be addressed those direful words, 'I know you not.'* It must be so; for I, at least, can see no alternative between admission and final exclusion. Those words in my judgment *could not apply* to any who have ever known the grace of God in truth, in whom the faintest spark of saving faith ever burned, who ever bent the suppliant knee in sincerity before the throne, or breathed even the feeblest prayer into the Saviour's ear. As applied to such, they *would not be true:* for Christ could never forget, any more than he could reject the petition of even the lowliest penitent. His voice would be remembered, his person infallibly recognised by the Omniscient Shepherd. This doctrine, therefore, not only excludes me from the marriage feast, but actually unchristianises me altogether! Those whom Christ *does not know*, cannot be his. For is it not written, "The Lord *knoweth* them that are his." ?† 'Tis true that the teachers of this exclusive doctrine speak of the 'foolish virgins' as being 'virgins still,' and hold out the distant hope of admission at some future time, after passing through the fiery furnace of tribulation seven times heated. But what consolation is that to me, even could I receive it as truth? I *cannot* indulge that hope, any more than I can accept that doctrine. For, to my mind, the answer of Christ to the foolish virgins, 'I know you not,' is *fatal* to their recovery at any future period, however remote: unless indeed we adopt the baseless theory of Origen and his followers. Now the 'elective doctrine' of Mr. Maude ranks me at once among the 'foolish;' for too well I know that I am pre-eminent in nothing but unfaithfulness and imperfection. Farewell then, a long farewell to all those sweet dreams and blissful visions! The midnight cry, 'Behold, the Bridegroom cometh,' for which I was wont to watch with ears intent and on the stretch to catch its first sound, will only now strike terror and dismay to my soul."

---

* It must be evident to any one who reads his Bible in a child-like spirit, that those who are destined for the honour of Translation are identical with the wise virgins of the parable.

† 2 Timothy ii. 19.

Digitized by Google

We should deeply regret in any way to misrepresent the opinions of one so highly and justly esteemed as Mr. Maude, and who, by his bold and able defence of the grand doctrine of "immortality only through Christ," has done such eminent service to the cause of truth. But there is no room for mistake or misapprehension. His doctrine his enunciated with all his usual clearness and precision. He speaks of the "Translation of the saints" as a very *special* reward, "for which a *special* meetness" is required, and to which "none shall attain," "without some *special* readiness."

Again, he adopts as his own the words of a recent writer, "from whose views on the subject of unfulfilled prophecy" he, nevertheless, "totally dissents," who asks, "Have we any ground from Scripture to expect that any of God's children, now or hereafter, shall be caught up in the air, without their having been *previously and pre-eminently sanctified* by the Spirit of the Lord, in order te render them meet for such an exalted honour?"

This is quite sufficient to show that we have not misrepresented Mr. Maude's views, with which we must say, in the most emphatic terms, we are at issue on every point. We maintain, in direct opposition thereto, that "Translation" is not a "special reward," distinguishing one true believer from another less "pre-eminently sanctified;" but that, on the contrary, "such honour have *all* his saints;"* and that no "special meetness" or special readiness is required of any one, other than that he be found in Christ at his appearing, united to him by a living faith as a branch in the true vine, and having the "oil" of grace in his heart, as well as the lamp of profession in his hand.

We lay it therefore as a first charge against the doctrine of Mr. Maude, and all who side with him on this subject, that its inevitable tendency is to "make the heart of the righteous sad, whom" the Lord hath "not made sad."† And what makes the charge the heavier, is that the degree of sadness, and depression, and despondency, will ever be in direct proportion to the progress of the individual in humility, the first of all Christian graces, that is, in fact, to his advance in the divine life! Surely that cannot be true which has such an effect.

II. We affirm now, in the second place, and that confidently, that the "elective doctrine" of Mr. Maude's is *most dangerous*. It is so because it contradicts and makes void *the doctrines of grace*. The crowning issue of salvation is admission to the marriage feast—"Blessed are they which are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb." Now that the whole of our salvation, from first to last, is *of grace only* will not be denied, we apprehend, by any reader of the *Rainbow*, so that of that point we have no need to offer proof. If wholly of grace, then is *boasting* excluded, as it is

* Psalm cxix. 9. † *Pr. Bk. Version.*

Digitized by Google

written, "Where is boasting, then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay, but by the law of faith."* But according to Mr. Maude's doctrine, "boasting" is not and cannot be "excluded." For if those only are admitted to the honour of "translation," or (what we maintain is one and the same thing,) "to the marriage supper," who are "pre-eminently sanctified by the Spirit of the Lord," then all such *have* cause for boasting over those who are not so distinguished. They may not be disposed to do so, but, assuredly, they have cause, and *good cause* for glorying over those less "sanctified" brethren.

The parable of the pounds or talents may be alleged as showing that different degrees of diligence in the Lord's servants will be differently rewarded—some being appointed to rule over "ten cities," others over "five cities," and so on. This is not for a moment denied. But it should be remembered that the distribution of rewards takes place *in the kingdom*, after the "nobleman has returned, having received the kingdom,"† and has, therefore, nothing to do with *admission* to the kingdom, or what is the same thing, to the marriage supper. All who have made a good use of their talents, whether more or less, are graciously received, and to all alike are these cheering words addressed, "Well done, good and faithful servant," &c.; "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."‡ But *when admitted*, some are stationed in a higher rank than others.

The simple fact of "admission" is the subject of another parable; that, viz., of the labourers in the vineyard, in which the reward is the same precisely to all—the same to those who came at the eleventh hour, as to those who had borne the "heat and burden of the day." The "penny" seems to be, in general, "eternal life" (or immortality), which is the common boon of all the saved. Now, eternal life is the "gift of God,"§ conditional *only* on possession of the Son. "He that hath the Son hath life;"‖ or, what is evidently the same thing, only under a different emblem, on having "oil" (the true grace of God) in their vessels (*i.e.* hearts), together with the lighted lamp of profession. But not a word is said in the parable *as to the amount* of oil possessed by each; though it is only natural to suppose that some, having more forethought, or, perchance, more capacious vessels, may have stored up more oil than others. All the wise had, at least, sufficient to trim their lamps at the sudden call, and *all such* were, without either question or delay, at once admitted.

Nothing is more certain than that every disciple of the Lord Jesus shall have to undergo a searching inquisition into his life and works. "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done,

* Romans iii. 27.
† Luke xix. 15. ‡ Matthew xxv. 21. § Romans vi. 23; 1 John v. 11. ‖ Ibid. v. 12.

Digitized by Google

whether it be good or bad." (2 Cor. v. 10.) "So, then, every one of us shall give account of himself to God." (Rom. xiv. 12.) We are moreover warned that "judgment must begin at the house of God." (1 Peter iv. 17.) But when? Where? and for what purpose? Is it before or after admission? Does the Bridegroom institute this searching enquiry at the moment of his first meeting with the expectant virgins, and with a view to ascertaining their several titles to admission? Or is it after he has entered into the marriage with his accepted ones, and the door has been shut? These are manifestly questions of primary importance, on the true answer to which the whole matter in debate must depend.

Now, we submit with confidence that no indication whatever is given in the parable, or in any collateral Scriptures, of any such previous enquiry or investigation. The Bridegroom sets out upon his journey—meets the waiting virgins; and, *forthwith*, we are informed, and without, apparently, one moment's delay, "they that were ready went in with him to the marriage, and the door was shut." No trace, nor hint of any previous enquiry, or investigation of titles are given; but all who were found with lamps trimmed and lighted were at once admitted—all others were excluded; and if the awful words, "I know you not," be taken in their plain, natural signification, excluded finally and for ever.

The conclusion that the sentence must be understood to signify their *final* rejection, is strengthened by reference to another parable, evidently relating to the same time, the same event, and the same parties—that, viz., in Luke xiii. 25: "When once the Master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer, and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are." All this is so evidently parallel to the parable of the virgins that it needs no proof. But when the outsiders persist in pressing for admission—pleading their former privileges: "We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets"—the Master goes much further, and adds to his former reply, "Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity." Surely this additional sentence is decisive of the question. Those addressed in such awful terms can never, at any future period, be received into favour. Their portion (as it is expressly declared verse 28), is where "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth;" when they should see "Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God," and they "themselves thrust out."

It is apparent, therefore, that the inquisition into the use made of their talents by the Lord's servants is a transaction subsequent to the shutting of the door against the foolish virgins; and that it is made, not with the view of ascertaining their title to admission, but for settling their respective places *in the kingdom*, and for apportioning their rewards.

Digitized by Google

If the "judgment" of the "house of God" does not take place *at the coming* of the Bridegroom, it must, of course, be subsequent to that event And what time so natural and appropriate as during the interval between the Lord's coming as the Bridegroom, to take away his bride to the "chambers" of refuge (Isaiah xxvi. 20); and his coming as the Avenger, to overthrow the usurper, and establish his kingdom on the reclaimed earth? All the time that Antichrist is running his course of blasphemy on earth, this solemn, indeed, yet friendly* investigation would seem to be going on in the heavens—for it would necessarily be a work of time. And when all the saints have been duly marshalled in their several stations about their Bridegroom-King, then they accompany him in his triumphant progress again to earth, on which, it should be remembered, he will not as yet have set his foot. Of course, we may be wrong in this conjecture; but it being evident that the trial does not and cannot take place before the advent, we can imagine no more suitable time than this interval. It would appear, then, from all these considerations, that "Translation" is not a "special reward," for which "special meetness" is required, but the common destiny of all saints, who, being represented by the "wise virgins," are ALL admitted to the marriage supper, without any other test being applied, than that they be found in readiness at the Bridegroom's advent, with their lamps trimmed and lighting. It follows, also, that the foolish virgins symbolise those who have not the grace of God, and *never* had it, and who, therefore, are shut out finally and for ever.

II. The truth and justice of these conclusions will be amply confirmed by a brief glance at the *positive* teaching of Scripture. Now, searching carefully its sacred pages, we learn :—

1. That at the second great act of the Advent, when the Lord comes as Avenger to relieve his oppressed people† and to execute judgment upon their oppressors, he is distinctly said to bring all his saints with him. Thus (Zech. xiv. 5), "And the Lord my God shall come, and *all the saints* with thee." No doubt this refers to the second act of the Advent, for (verse 3) it is said, "Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations" —those, viz., which had just been gathered against Jerusalem, and had taken and sacked that city with such circumstances of wanton cruelty. This appears to be the last drop in the bitter cup they are yet destined to drain and wring out the dregs thereof. The Lord's wrath is then fully accomplished, and he comes to the final relief and salvation of his ancient people. Let it be observed, that when he does so come, he is to bring ALL the saints with him.

* "Friendly," because for the purpose of apportioning rewards—not at all with a view to punishment.

† The Jews; then groaning under the oppression of "The Man of Sin," and in the midst of "the great tribulation."

Digitized by Google

2. The prophecy of Enoch, rescued from oblivion by St. Jude, speaks the same language (Jude 14, 15): "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam,* prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment," etc. The latter words, "to execute judgment" show that the time is when he comes, not as the loving Bridegroom, but as the stern and terrible Avenger. And the expression, "ten thousands," is so evidently general, meaning *all his saints*, that it would seem to require no proof. Either it stands for ALL, and the plural form is used merely to show how very numerous they are; or, if limited, it must be to literal bodies or battalions of ten thousand each. No doubt it means all.

3. The vision of St. John also (Rev. xix. 11—16) evidently refers to *the same period;* and the terms he employs are as evidently expressive of universality. For, after describing the glorious appearance of the great Captain of our salvation, as he will be seen by all its inhabitants when he comes to "shake terribly the earth," he adds (verse 14), "And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean." The "fine linen, clean and white"—expounded (verse 8) to be "the righteousness of saints"—shows that his followers are not angels, but the redeemed from among men. And the plural word, "armies," again gives the ideas not only of universality and great numbers, but—what is most important to our present enquiry—of *order* and *organisation.*†

Now, if *all the saints* (in their multitudes) thus appear with the Avenger at his coming to establish his kingdom upon the ruins of all earthly kingdoms, clearly and evidently they must have been *previously* gathered to him. And at what period could they be so gathered save at his previous coming to take away his Bride from earth, as symbolised in the parable of the virgins? This gathering is quite in accordance with numerous other Scriptures.

4. For example, in the fiftieth Psalm, which so evidently relates to his appearing (verse 5): "Gather my saints (surely *all* my saints) together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice"—that is, all true believers; for all such are equally interested in the "covenant." Who would infer from this a limited number only? Or who would suppose that any of his true saints would be left behind, or excluded as "foolish virgins"? It seems incredible that any could cherish an idea

* We regret to observe that Mr. Maude, in the aforesaid article, make so much of this circumstance. His calculations and numbers are by no means clear, even to the learned; whilst to the unlearned, *i.e.*, to the "Babes in Christ," they are utterly unintelligible and perplexing. We feel so jealous of "mysticism" in all its moods and tenses (considering it synonymous with "mystification"), that we would heartily desire to see it banished from all scriptural expositions.

† "Important" as showing that the investigation, etc., had taken place.

Digitized by Google

so repulsive, so cruel, and so utterly disheartening! Yet this must be so if the "elective doctrine" be true.

5. Still more strongly will this appear from our Saviour's own words (Matt. xxiv. 31): "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." If these words do not imply universality, we know not how universality could be expressed; for, "his elect" must mean the whole body of the elect, else would some kind of qualification have been introduced. And they are gathered from the "four winds," *i.e.*, from every point of the compass—east, west, north, and south; and "from one end of heaven to the other;" which can only mean from every portion of the earth's surface underlying the canopy of the heaven, or atmosphere that surrounds it.

It will not be denied, we suppose, that this prophecy of the Saviour, as well as the parables referred to in the former part of this paper, all relate to the same event and period; viz., the Advent of the Bridegroom, when he comes in the air (*but not then to the earth*), and takes away his elect to present them "faultless before the presence of his (Father's) glory with exceeding joy." Then, as we conceive, commences in heaven the inquisition by which the rank of each shall be determined; so that when next he comes, as the Avenger, they may accompany him—a compact and glorious army, or combination of "armies," each in its appointed station. Shall we now say that any poor suffering child of God, who has been "looking for and hastening unto" this day and longing for him at whose appearing he has been taught to expect a crown of righteousness, shall be left behind shivering in the "outer darkness" and exposed to all the fury of the Man of Sin? whilst he beholds his more favoured brethren (whether few or many matters nothing) "translated" aloft to the skies? Forbid it, heaven! forbid it, every principle of equity and truth! forbid it every assurance that all are saved equally by grace through faith only! forbid it every precious promise of the everlasting gospel, in which we search in vain for any limitation of the grace of God! Forbid it that we should do this dishonour to our Divine Master by any such banking up the full stream of his love that it may flow in a narrow channel, more in accordance with our conceptions of the fitness of things! Yet this dishonour to the Saviour, this practical denial of free grace, this opening of the door for envy, jealousy, and vainglorious boasting—this unauthorised limitation of the divine goodness, are *the inevitable results* of the cruel and disheartening doctrine advanced in the aforesaid essay!

That the author of the Essay on "Enoch, a Type of the Translated Saints," never once foresaw that his peculiar views would be so construed, we have not the least doubt. That he would himself be the first to

Digitized by Google

deprecate any such inferences we are fully persuaded: but a moment's reflection will convince any thoughtful Christian that such would and *must be* the effect of the doctrine in question upon the humble believer; and the more humble, the more depressed thereby and despondent he would become.

6. If the question as to the universality, or otherwise of the "Translation," were to be decided only by the apostle's description of the scene, it alone, we contend, would be sufficient to compel an affirmative answer. For (1 Thess. iv. 13—18) when giving his Thessalonian converts the true comfort under bereavement, that they might not sorrow as others "which have no hope," he says: "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus (surely the whole body of them) will God bring with him." By what authority does any one venture to narrow the number to a select few only? Or what comfort would it have conveyed to the Thessalonians to be told that *some of their friends* who slept might chance to be among the number; but that the rest would have to abide in their graves for an indefinite period? Strange consolation that would be when each individual would be exposed to the chilling fear that his own beloved ones would be amongst the latter portion! We hold it as evident that this description relates to the ingathering or harvest of the saints at the coming of the Bridegroom, and is therefore directly in point to our present enquiry.

Again, the apostle says, "We which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent (go before) them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first." "*The dead* in Christ"—surely that implies ALL the dead in Christ, or words have no meaning. Let the reader now, who is anxious for the truth attend carefully to what follows—for here is the actual "Translation of the Saints"—and let him judge for himself whether the narrow and exclusive doctrine has any, the least atom, of foundation in this inspired prophecy. "Then we which are alive and remain"—surely that means ALL which are alive and remain. The apostle speaks in the person (as it were) of the whole collective body of the saints who shall be still abiding in the flesh at the appearing of the Bridegroom. And we confidently affirm that if so much as one were omitted; if but one—though he were the meanest child, the most ignorant peasant in whom shall be found, were it but a spark, of true, living, genuine faith—be left out, the apostle's words *would not be true.* But he goes on, "We which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them (the risen dead) in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." This now is the "Translation of the Saints," and we leave it to

Digitized by Google

our readers to judge whether there be one atom of foundation for the assertion that it is a *very special reward* for which *very special meetness* is required, or whether it be not true what we affirmed in the beginning, that "this honour have *all his saints*."

7. The same observations will hold good of 1 Cor. xv. 50—52, where the same apostle speaking on the same subject, supplies what was omitted in his epistle to the Thessalonians, namely, that those which "are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord" are *transformed* before their "translation." "We shall not all sleep," he says, "but we shall ALL be changed. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, &c., &c., and we (*i.e.*, we which are alive and remain) shall be changed," *i.e.*, we ALL, as he says in the previous verse. Here again is no room for exclusiveness, no foundation for Mr. Maude's "elective doctrine," but, combining the two statements (that in Thessalonians and the present), the apostle affirms, as positively and as plainly as words can affirm any thing, that at his coming, *i.e.*, when he shall next come as the Bridegroom, ALL the sleeping saints shall be raised incorruptible, glorious, powerful, spiritual and immortal: and ALL the living saints shall be changed instantaneously, and, being clothed upon with immortality, both together shall be "caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so to be for ever with him."

8. Once more, and only once, we consider 2 Tim. iv. 8, to be a very strong—indeed unanswerable—proof of the doctrine for which we are contending. "Henceforth" the apostle says "there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." As all true Christians (however mistaken they may be as to time and mode) *must* love Christ's appearing, we see not how the "elective doctrine" can be maintained. The only question is as to the day—of what day does St. Paul speak when he says "at that day"? Is it when he comes as the Bridegroom, or as the avenger?* We consider there can be no doubt it is

* The writer is strongly of opinion that the error against which he is contending arises, at least in great measure, from not duly recognising the different acts of Christ's advent—that, is his coming as "The Bridegroom," and his coming as "The Avenger." At the first *all his saints* are gathered to him; and the *predicted mode* of their ingathering is by "Translation," the dead being first raised and the living changed. Thus rapt away, like Elijah, into heaven, their comparative merits are there investigated, and their several stations appointed. This, apparently at least, would be a work of time; and just as completed, Antichrist will have filled up the measure of his iniquity by persecuting and oppressing the ancient people of God, and the "grapes" of the earth be "fully ripe" for the sickle. (Rev. xiv. 18.) Then follows the *second* act when Christ comes as "The Avenger," bringing *all his saints* with him, *previously* gathered, marshalled, and arranged in their several degrees of rank, so as to form a compact and well organised army, or "armies." Thus at the *first act* is the ingathering of the saints by "Translation:" and at the *second act* is the overthrow of his foes—the "judgment" of the "house," or "family" of God having been transacted during the interval. But for the scriptural evidences and arguments by which these opinions are sustained, the present writer must refer to his recently published work, "The Prophecies of the Last Days." *Simpkin & Marshall, London; and W. Laxton, Dudley, Worcestershire.*

Digitized by Google

the former, inasmuch as, among many other reasons, the "harvest" in Scripture invariably precedes the "vintage:" the former being the ingathering of the saints: the latter the overthrow and destruction of the wicked (see for example Rev. xiv. 15—20). If so, then the time when the apostle, with ALL them also that love his appearing, shall receive their crown, is synchronous with the parable of the virgins, and our point is established.

We have *by no means* exhausted our store of texts or arguments. But, drawing out our observations to any greater length, we fear we should exhaust the patience of both the editor and the readers of this periodical. The question is one of intense interest as well as of *vital* importance. For, to say nothing of its injurious bearing upon the doctrines of grace, if the narrow and elective view of the saints' translation be maintained, we see not how Christ's ministers can any longer hold out to their people the advent as an object of desire and love. They will very naturally say to us, "If the translation be a 'special reward' for which a 'special meetness' is required; if *only* those shall participate therein, or in the blessedness of those who are called to the 'marriage supper of the Lamb,' who are '*pre-eminent*' saints, and of the type of Enoch, then it is clearly not for us. We can have no part nor lot in the matter, for, alas! we are *pre-eminent* only in weakness, infirmity, and imperfection!* Why exhort us to look for the 'appearing of the great God, even our Saviour, Jesus Christ,' when we can only expect to be left out in the 'outer darkness, where is weeping and gnashing of teeth'? For we clearly see that the fate of the man who intruded into the marriage feast, not having on a 'wedding garment,' is identical with that of the 'foolish virgins;' the time and parties being the same. Alas! then, for us, that day will be to us evermore an object of dire dread and terror!" So they would reply, and most justly. Indeed, we cannot see how any true Christian—holding the views of Mr. Maude—can look forward to the advent otherwise than with apprehension and alarm. He must be very differently constituted from ordinary Christians, if he can view it otherwise. Oh! it is a cold, disheartening doctrine! one calculated at once to mystify the judgment, upset the faith, and chill the heart of every humble believer. God forbid it had any, even one grain of truth, or one atom of foundation in the word of God! as we fully believe it has not.

We would therefore earnestly intreat those who advance such narrow and exclusive views, as they value the peace of their weaker brethren, and the progress of prophetic truths, to pause and consider the inevitable consequences of such teaching, especially in times like the present, when the faith and Christian principles of so many are trembling in the balance! and the

* We contend that every true saint would thus judge and speak of himself; just as St. Paul does so often in his epistles.

Digitized by Google

doctrine of the pre-millennial advent and personal reign are looked upon with suspicion and dislike by so many! Assuredly they are exciting fresh prejudices against those glorious doctrines! And, as assuredly they are (unconsciously we have no doubt, but not the less certainly) doing that which the Lord himself so strongly condemns; they are "making the hearts of the righteous sad, whom he hath not made sad." (Ezek. xiii. 22.) We know it must be so, from our own private feelings. We confess that when we first read that otherwise most interesting, and in some things valuable, paper of Mr. Maude, it sent a chill through our very heart that we shall not speedily forget. And it was not until we had carefully reconsidered, and gone over again and again the grounds of our own convictions upon the subject, that peace of mind was in any measure restored.

For all these reasons, because it is so utterly disheartening to the humble believer; because it is subversive of the doctrines of grace; and because it is so utterly inconsistent with and opposed, as we have seen, to the express and positive teaching of Holy Scripture, we entirely dissent from the narrow and exclusive views advanced in the aforesaid essay. And we trust the excellent and able writer thereof will reconsider, or at least explain and modify his statements—for they are likely to do (and, if we may judge by our own feelings, have done) *incalculable mischief*.

May the great Master give us all a right understanding in this as in all other matters that concern the peace and welfare of his people; that so we, such of us at least as are teachers, may be able rightly to instruct, and edify, and *comfort* the poor and the feeble-minded of his precious flock. Amen.

The Vicarage,
Tipton, Staffs.

WM. KER.

'THE MORNING COMETH.'

THE DARKER THE NIGHT THE NEARER THE DAWNING.

"The burden of Dumah. He calleth to me out of Seir, Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will enquire, enquire ye: return, come"—Isa. xxi., 11, 12.

THE prophet is here represented as standing amid the captives of Babylon. Edom is the fellow-captive of his kinsman, Jacob. As a watchman, the prophet is looking forth from his tower of vision into the future. He beholds the chariots of Media advancing, the horsemen of Persia are speeding, hastening to the rescue, for they are the redeemers of Israel from bondage. Elam is coming up; Media is rushing to the siege. The sighs of the captive are soon to be hushed; yea, they are to be

Digitized by Google

exchanged for the voice of melody. The cry, as they advance, waxes louder and clearer, 'Babylon is fallen!' The exulting watchman crieth aloud for very gladness, Edom is startled by the cry; but in unbelief, in *mockery*, he tauntingly exclaims, "Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?" The watchman replies with the cry of *earnest warning*, 'The morning cometh: the night of our captivity is far spent, streaks of light are seen in our horizon: joy cometh in the morning. The day-spring from on high is visiting us. Your night is still to be prolonged, enveloping you in its shroud of gloom. But oh, if ye will enquire seriously, anxiously, repentingly; enquire ye with humility, with full purpose of heart: return ye to the God of Abraham, our common Father; return ye while he may be found; seek him while he is near; enquire ye, return, come. Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is arising upon thee.' Such I take to be the meaning of this obscure burden of Dumah. Read the similar burden of the prophet Obadiah; compare the two together, and you will arrive at the same conclusions. But let the events of present history speak out the prediction of twenty-five centuries ago as most mournfully fulfilled. Densest night hath gathered over the fatness of Edom. A desolation of desolation hath it become. Dumah has been a comparatively unknown land, even from the times of the lion-hearted Richard of England. If, in these days of daring enterprise, the researches of the explorer have opened up the fastnesses of Seir, it is that the bold adventurer may realise prophecy by surrendering *his life* as the penalty of his intrusion. It is a marvel indeed, in the present state of our world for any highways to be untrodden by the foot of man; but the roads of Idumæa, one of the oldest colonisations of the world, are untracked even to this present hour; Edom is sealed up in an irreversible doom. Could the Christian enter the wastes of Edom, with his Bible in his hand, when he tires of the contemplation of barrenness and ruin, let him read of Edom's curse; let him wonder at the dread detail of fulfilment in the scene before him. *Truly her night is come.* Silence, deep, tomblike silence, has settled over her rocky dells, interrupted only by screams of the eagles, the screech of the owl, upbraiding the intrusion. *Truly her night is come.*

We hear in this cry of the scoffing Idumæan the exclamation of infidelity, the outcry of the Laodicæan church of this our own eventful time. 'Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation. Where is the word of the Lord? Let it come now. Surely the days are prolonged, and every vision faileth: the vision is for many days to come, and he prophesieth of times that are very far off. Let him speed and hasten his work, that we may see it: let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come that we may know it. My Lord delayeth his coming. Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?' Do ye enquire seriously? The watchmen are on their turrets of observation: they are watching narrowly, as they who watch for the morning: they see the streaks of light gilding the tops of the eastern hills, even as the beauteous footfalls of kindliest messengers bearing joyous tidings. Let us look at some of these indications, and may we enlist the aid of the Holy Spirit of God to guide us into all truth; to 'direct our hearts unto the love of God, and the patient waiting for Christ.'

Digitized by Google

We learn, then, that *wickedness is to increase*, that wicked men are to wax worse and worse, even until the glorious appearing of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. What saith St. Paul: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that *in the latter times* men shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron." (1 Tim. iv. 1, 2.) And again, in the last epistle he ever wrote, even on the eve of martyrdom, the spirit of prophecy stirs his soul, and he gives forth warning notes as to the times of the end: "This know also, that *in the last days* perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." (2 Tim. iii. 1—5.) What a fearful census of iniquities. Hear also what earnest words Simon Peter wrote, just before being offered up on the altar of martyrdom:—"Knowing this first, that *in the last days* there shall come scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming?" (2 Peter iii. 3, 4.) Such, then, is to be the sad state of this our world in *the time of the end*, according to the express witness of the Spirit of truth, against which there can be no appeal. Although I understand these descriptions to apply to the last twelve hundred and sixty days of the reign of Antichrist, that mystery of iniquity, yet we see plainest indications in the growing evil of the day of what may be anticipated in the time of unbridled licentiousness, of open rebuke, of daring blasphemies. Again, the apostle Paul, or rather the Holy Spirit of God, the fount of the apostle's inspiration guiding him into all truth, adjures the Thessalonians in the most solemn terms: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, either by spirit, or by word, or by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the Son of Perdition, who oppresseth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." It is the great Antichrist of the last age, with the appearance of the Lamb, with the blasphemies of the dragon. The Great Teacher himself, in a succession of parables, taught us that there should be dreadful degeneracy in the last times. Listen to one of these: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a *net* that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; which, when it was full, they drew to shore and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, and threw the bad away. *So shall it be at the end of the world.* Jesus saith unto them, Have ye understood these things?' And let me repeat this most solemn enquiry, Have ye understood these things? He uttered yet another parable, of equal significance, on the very same occasion: 'The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man that sowed good seed in his field: but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good

Digitized by Google

seed in thy field; from whence then hath it tares? He saith unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? and he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest." (Matt. xiii. 24—30.) Are you saying with the disciples, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field? Listen, then, to the explanation of Jesus himself, lest we be tempted to attach some meaning in accordance with the preconceptions of our own minds. 'He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom: but the tares are the children of the wicked one, the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world.' Our especial attention, moreover, is called to this explanation by the Saviour. 'Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.'

Let me call your attention to yet another parable; a third testimony from the Son of Man himself: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto *leaven*, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." In eleven different passages we meet with the mention of *leaven*, as expressive of evil. St. Paul, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, who was conversant with all the usages of the Jews, writes to the Corinthians of notorious scandalous sinners, who infect a whole church with their corrupting influence: "Your glorifying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out, therefore, the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us (this sacrifice was to be eaten with pure, unleavened bread): therefore let us keep the feast not with old, sour leaven, nor with the leaven of malice aud wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." Our blessed Lord himself also warns his disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. He bade them not beware of the leaven of *bread*, but of the doctrines of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees; even of their corrupting doctrines, the *traditious of the elders*. Such may be among the doctrines that are to '*leaven* the whole lump until the whole be *leavened*' in these times of the end. Shall we bring forward a fourth parable in attestation of this truth? "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a grain of mustard-seed, which a man took and sowed in his field; which indeed is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree; so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." We have been so accustomed to dwell upon the *marvellous growth* of this tree, that we have utterly lost sight of the *unclean, ravening birds polluting* the tree—*types* of *evil* which shall infest the church in the time of the end. Yes, the whole tenor of Bible revealings is to the effect that iniquity is to abound; that the love of many is to wax cold. What is the full meaning of our Lord's enquiry, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Who does not anticipate the mournful answer? No! The silence of the Saviour is eloquence indeed, and most touchingly tender.

Yet, another parable will we allude to in confirmation of this point; the well-remembered parable of the *ten virgins*.

They are all *virgins*, each has her lamp, and each has some degree of expectancy of the heavenly Bridegroom. But fully half of these were

Digitized by Google

foolish; they had lamps, but they *lacked the oil.* They had the lamp of profession, but lacked the oil of preparedness; the light that was in them was darkness. These are they who "having the form of godliness, deny the power thereof;" upon these the day of the Lord, the end of the world, shall come in a time when they are not aware, even as in the days that were before the flood. These shall cry unto the heavenly Bridegroom, "Lord! Lord, open unto us: have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works? Then will he profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye *workers of iniquity.*" We have referred to the days of Noah, as in those days there were chambering and wantonness; surfeiting and drunkenness; marrying and giving in marriage; utter indifference, utter unconcern; notwithstanding many a warning voice; in spite of the watchman's cry; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. God forbid that the degeneracy should be as extreme and universal, as in those days, wherein only *eight* persons were saved; but yet the analogy points to *few,* comparatively, relatively *few,* who shall be faithful unto death, striving against sin!

This fearful roll of iniquities shall not be fully illustrated until the incarnation of the Son of perdition—until the manifestation of the Antichrist of evil, until *the brief space* of the time of the end. Then shall sin rage its final hour; then shall be the reign of terror, of blasphemy, of woe. Listen to the warning of the last of the epistles: "Beloved, remember the words which were spoken before by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; how that they told you there should be mockers *in the last times,* who should walk after their own ungodly lusts." Nay, it would appear that in these coming times of prodigies and marvels of judgment, as prediction after prediction is bursting into terrible fulfilment, mankind shall be *willingly ignorant,* wilfully blinded. We say not that these floods of swelling wickedness have as yet begun to rise; it is rather the lull of apathy, the lethargy of piety, the lukewarmness of Christian zeal, that ominous calm that precedes the impending storm! The Saviour knocking at the door of his slumbering church, as though he would awake her from her supineness: "I would thou wert either cold or hot!" In the times of the ancient Levite-service, it was the duty of one of the priests to go the nightly rounds of the Temple, and if he observed any delinquent Levite asleep at his post of sacred trust, he was ordered to set fire to the robe of the unwatchful one; and either the smell of fire, or the stifling smoke, or the scorching flame soon awoke the sleeper. As a penalty for this unwatchfulness, the delinquent was compelled to serve the temple in this singed or charred robe throughout the next day. Jesus is walking amidst his golden candlesticks, and as he sees his slumbering church, weary with his protracted delay, he exclaims, "Behold I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth and *keepeth his garments,* lest he walk *naked* and men see his *shame.* What I say unto you, I say unto all, WATCH." Nay, as though the garment of the slumberer had been burnt away in the deep sleep of unwatchfulness, the Saviour cries, "I counsel thee to buy of me *white raiment,* that thou mayest be clothed and that the *shame* of thy *nakedness* do not appear," The morning cometh; the darker the night the nearer the dawning!

But if there is to be a lack of *real wisdom,* that of the wise and under-

Digitized by Google

standing heart, there is to be no dearth of secular knowledge. "Knowledge is to run to and fro in the earth." Even the most superficial thinker, the most cursory observer must admit this to be the prominent feature of these times of the end. Truly marvellous would be the statistics of our literature should any curious compiler give them forth to the world. Think of the millions of copies of our daily journals, catering for some new thing, wherewith to sate the greedy thirst of enquiring multitudes. Add to these the thousands of quarterly, monthly, and weekly serials administering to the intellectual tastes of thousands on thousands of every language in the range of civilisation. Add to these the abounding literature, which panders to the mere morbid taste for that which is sensational, sentimental, humurous or profane. Let there be enrolled upon the swelling catalogue those tracts and pamphlets, which Christianity is pouring forth from its press. Above all, let the numbers be told of the precious Book Divine. *Four* copies *per minute* issue forth from the grand emporium at Blackfriars! Truly, "the knowledge of the glory of the Lord is being sent to and fro in the earth;" thus enhancing the guiltiness of these times of the end. Each science, too, has its silent emissaries, unfolding its peculiar secrets to each enquiring mind. And this supply tells us of demand for some new thing in knowledge. It tells us that a spirit of enquiry is abroad, agitating multitudes, arousing them to think, and reason, and invent. A republic of mind is being set up. The millions are asserting their prerogative to think for themselves, no longer tamely submitting to the authoritative dictates of the select few, who have usurped the oligarchy of mind. This freeborn spirit of enquiry is awakening, arousing busy thought, bracing it for daring explorations. Education is polishing many a shaft for the coming onslaught upon the fastnesses of indifference and ignorance. Nay, in its half enlightenment, reason is daring to be sceptical on truths of God's revealing. Not brooking mystery, spurning to walk as yet by faith, it would test the truthfulness of God—with too self-reliant reasonings it would determine for itself. Hence the grim phenomena of Rationalism, Ritualism, Spiritualism, Mormonism—types of the half-enlightened mind struggling to be free.

Fresh pathways of progress are continually opening. Man boldly ventures on, no longer taken by surprise by any fresh discovery. Wearied with the commonplaces of the past, he is panting after the loftier sphere of action, for ampler range of thought. It is the spirit of man awaking from a dream, starting into self-consciousness. Man is at length aroused to the fact, the day is far spent; yea, to the dread that his sun may go down while it is yet day. He hath a presentiment that "the time is short" for thought, enquiry, or enterprise. Yes! if our sluggard world hath slept far into the day, it is now girding up its loins, as though it would in very deed "*buy back the time.*"

That amiable optimist, Dr. Channing, thus confirmed our view:—"History and philosophy plainly show to me, in human nature, the principles and foundations of a new state of things; and Christianity concurs in these."

The late Dr. Arnold, whose powerful, far-seeing mind has moulded some of the best thinkers of this age, used to say with deep emotion: "My sense of the evils of these times that are coming, and of the prospects to which I am bringing up my children, is overwhelming. Times are coming

Digitized by Google

in which the devil will fight his best, and in good earnest." The sober *Edinburgh Review* thus records its verdict: "Never was there a time when events developed themselves with such rapidity. As the world moves on it seems to accelerate its speed, and to precipitate itself with headlong haste. Events seem to ripen before their time. The crises comes almost as soon as we are aware of the commencement. Speed, whirlwind speed, is the order of the day." The late Sir Robert Peel uttered many weighty and calmly reasoned words. He used to say, "Every aspect of this present age, viewed in the light of the past, warrants the belief that we are on the eve of a universal change."

To meet the demands of these stirring times, nature is exerting the mightiness of her power; or, rather man is laying hold of her mightiness, and hence art is displaying exhaustless combinations of wonders. These in their turn give place to still grander marvels. Intelligence is speeding round each continent across many a sea, yea, through the vast ocean itself; not merely in the swift ship, but in the "winged words" of heaven's lightning; soon to girdle this our planet, as with the zone of some fabled magician. In these days of marvellous locomotion, are we not gazing on the visions vouchsafed to prophets of the long, long ago? When ancient Rome was still governed by the Tarquins, the wondering prophet of Galilee beheld "the cars with flaming torches, and the fir trees terribly shaken; the cars raging in the ways, their show like torches, their speed like lightning." Think of our vast steam navies, our appliances of steam "on the broad ways," yea, jostling one another. Who shall say that the terriffic steam war, with its marvellous projectiles, shall not fill in these dim etchings of prophecy, even "the day of Jehovah's preparation" in the time of the end?

Stupendous marvels mark the present age. The heated axles of time are moving round with sevenfold speed. Event follows event with terriffic swiftness, and surprise flashes upon surprise. Startling are the discoveries, mighty are the creations, that the swift-rushing progress of modern civilisation is ever and anon throwing to the surface. Think upon the wondrous fact that the same mysterious power, ethereal, impalpable, that circulates through all the organs of plants and animals, that directs the silent course of the magnetic needle, and that ever and anon illuminates the whole horizon, is now made the obedient message-bearer of man —his swift-winged courrier, subtle as the light-beam and as fleet; space and time are vanquished, peoples and regions that have been severed by formidable barriers, are now brought into immediate proximity. A nation is converted into a neighbourhood, and man achieves a sort of universality of speech and action. Yea, ere these lines shall reach the eyes of the readers of the *Rainbow*, this wondrous appliance shall have entered each village, to be pressed into the uses of our daily life.

Philosophy is refining its subtleties to the utmost nicety, to satisfy the educated tastes of an advanced age. Reason, with sacrilegious intrusion, is venturiug into the holy place, where it ought not, preparing the way for the mystery of lawlessness. Reason is profanely submitting to the testing of its crucible, the hallowed truths which heavenly wisdom hath hidden from the wise and prudent, and revealed to the simple faith of babes. Reason is moulding after its own likeness articles of new creeds; and even now are appearing those "false teachers of the time

Digitized by Google

of the end, bringing in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them." Let us beware lest our liberalism degenerate into licentiousness, or a criminal apathy tolerating deceits, which shall too soon become rife indeed, and shall be the precursors of still more iniquitous deceivableness in the last reign of terror, of blasphemy, of woe. Surely the morning cometh. The darker the night, the nearer the dawning.

There would seem also to be political indications of this coming morning. In the time of the end, the fourth great empire is to be dominant; an empire occupying the empires of Babylon, Persia, Greece; hence represented by a hybrid monster, combining the lion, the bear, the leopard. This great power has yet to be developed; though, if the time of the end be so very nigh, he must be even now in embryo. On each side of its monstrous head are *five* horns, and in the analogous symbol on each foot are *five* toes. This fourth monarchy is to be none other than the Roman empire, co-extensive with the *three* empires that had preceded it. Soon shall this potentate revive, a worthy successor of the swordslain beast. Speculation has been rife as to his name, and the number of his name. Perhaps we are living too near to the time of this great potentate to see him in his colossal proportions. But can we catch the dim outline of the five toes on either foot of the image, or of the analogous five horns on either side of the head? These symbols show that *five* are to be in each division of the great empire; five on the one foot, in the east; five on the other foot, in the west. They are, moreover, to be of iron mixed with clay, partly strong, partly brittle, somewhat analogous to the constitutional governments of our modern times, in which the iron of despotism is blended with the democratic clay. We do not say or think that these ten kingdoms are actually in existence as they shall be; but, like their great suzerain, they must be in embryo; or otherwise the morning of the time of the end cannot be about to dawn. Let us see if we have any clue to the geographical position of these kingdoms.

First. As to the eastern division. The prophet Daniel predicting the disruption of the Grecian monarchy, distinctly intimates that the four divisions of it shall be in existence at the time of the end: 'in the latter days of their kingdom,' men are to have filled up their measure of iniquities; 'transgression is to be at the full:' the portentous false prophet, of fierce countenance, understanding dark sentences, the son of perdition, is to work signs to destroy those that have not the mark of the last great potentate. These four, then, the king of the south, Egypt; the king of the north, Syria; Greece, and Asia Minor, are to be revived kingdoms in the time of the end. Their kingdoms are to be conterminous with those of Alexander's four generals. Greece alone is out of the range of the Turkish empire, and is struggling bravely upward into a constitutional monarchy in this time of the end. For some time, notwithstanding the intervention of Western powers, Turkey has been sick, and ready to die. Out of its dismemberment shall arise Egypt, about to commence a career of spendour by the opening of the Suez canal. Soon shall Syria set herself free, and wage unequal war with the king of the South. Damascus shall rival Alexandria and Cairo. Asia Minor (the realm of Antigonus), shall absorb the rest of the Turkish empire. I cannot agree with some interpreters of these visions, that Palestine, or 'the pleasant land,' is to be one of these *five* horns. The restored Jewish nation holds an entirely distinct position in the time of the

Digitized by Google

end. They are to be a people favoured of the Lord. The great potentate is to make a covenant with Judæa, but not to conquer it. Tne king of fierce countenance, understanding dark sentences, destroying the holy people, is to vex her; but when the city is about to be taken (as we learn from the prophet Zachariah), the Son of Man shall be revealed on the Mount of Olivet, shall dash his foes in pieces like the vessels of clay; shall drive them away like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor; shall take the great potentate and his ally, the Mystery of Lawlessness, and shall cast them into the lake of fire. Before fixing upon the fifth eastern horn, let us endeavour to discover the five western horns. In the zenith of Roman glory, there appear to have been *five* Roman provinces. One of these used to be assigned to one of the consuls, just as circumstances might dictate. Of these, of course, *Italia* was the first, *Gallia* would be the second, *Iberia* would be the third, and *Germania* would be the fourth; the fifth would be *Africa*. *Algeria* is even now French, and the nucleus of the *fifth* western kingdom, that shall have power one hour with the great potentate of the time of the end. *Gallia*, *Italia*, and *Germania* are now wondrously constituted into constitutional monarchies, partly iron, partly clay, to serve under their great suzerain at the time of the end. Marvel not at this; for all the world shall wonder at the beast, and say, Who is like unto him? Who is able to make war with him? The other province was *Iberia*, the whole Spanish peninsula, and in the changes that are pending these kingdoms of Spain and Portugal shall plight their troth yet once again; shall become one of the western horns, completing the *tout ensemble* of the ursa-leonto-pardic beast. *Austria* alone remains; and although it would appear to belong to the western foot, yet the same might be said of *Greece*, which is as much in Europe as Austria herself. Let us adore the marvellous providence of God, that hath preserved Rome as a city *that is at unity in itself*. Its destiny is *not to be the capital of a dependent kingdom*, but to be the great metropolis of the time of the end; to be the centre of civilisation, arts, luxury; to be the scene of vice, of witcheries, of abominations; to be as 'a burning mountain,' heaved from its foundations, and plunged into the seething ocean of ruin.

Britannia never was a province of the Roman empire until after the reigns of Cæsar and his illustrious nephew; nor shall she be included in the ten dependencies of the time of the end. Prophecy appears to indicate closest sympathy between 'these isles of the sea' and Jehovah's peculiar people. A covenant there may be, a treaty there may be, on the part of these peculiar peoples and the last great potentate, but neither of them shall be either a horn of the hybrid monster in his hideousness, or a toe of the image of abomination that maketh desolate. Hath not each of these peculiar peoples, in its turn, been Jehovah's witness in a dark age? And although each nation hath been laden with iniquity, yet shall both be saved from this degradation of dependence. Such is the vision; though it tarry, wait for it; it shall come, it shall not tarry long. The morning cometh; then shall we wake from this troubled dream into newness of life. That shrewd economist, Mr. Robert Lowe, in his capacity as Chancellor of the Exchequer, has proposed a problem for solution, to reduce the gold coinage by one per cent., but to retain the price of bullion at the Mint as at present. Let us leave all fiscal, monetary, commercial advantages or complications to financiers, or the savans of the Social Science

Digitized by Google

Association, and let us look at one very significant aspect of the matter. The reduced coin will correspond almost exactly with a coin of France, to represent twenty-five francs in gold; that is to say, four sovereigns would be absolutely equal to five Napoleons. Moreover, the French government is prepared to issue a coin of the value of twenty-five francs, so as to be interchangeable with the English sovereign; nay, our reduced coin will be equivalent to the Prussian frederick, the Spanish doubloon, the American eagle. This will doubtless be most admirably adapted for international commerce, but we see something more in this assimilation of our coinage. The coin of a country has the mark, or the name of its ruler, or the number of his name. And during the decemregal kingdom of earth's last twelve hundred and sixty days, the little horn, like unto a lamb, shall 'cause all, both small and great, rich and poor, bond and free, to receive this mark in their right hand, and that no man may be able to *buy or sell* save he that shall have the mark, χαραγμα, or the name of the potentate, or the number of his name. The British sovereign has stood proudly aloof from all other coinage, asserting its independence, defying the example of every other country, and perplexing commercial calculations, entailing considerable discounts, and serving to prevent, or at any rate retard, international intercourse. We cannot resist the conviction that this peculiarity, and the resistance of all schemes of decimal coinage, has been overruled by providence to keep us as a nation apart from the decemregal alliance; to leave *Chittim* entirely independent for the avenging of the restored Israelites upon their northern invaders, as foretold by Ezekiel (xxxviii. 9). Already there seems to be a consentaneous outcry expressed by the press, representing all shades of public opinlon, against this 'sweating down' of the public coinage, and doubtless it is not to be effected in these times of the end. 'The merchants of Tarshish, with the young lions thereof,' the land *overshadowing* the sea *with the wings* of her monster navy, shall still be kept aloof in her insular and isolated neutrality, awaiting the bidding of the Lord of armies and the Sovereign Dispenser of the destiny of the world.

THE PROPHETIC HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

I. ISRAEL IN HISTORY.

THERE are three historical nations, the Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans; and to these we owe almost all that is known of ancient history. The monuments of Egyptian, Indian, and other ancient nations, are altogether fragmentary, and can give no solid basis for a national history. They are useful indeed in many ways, and worthy of the attention of antiquarians, as they furnish proper subjects for speculation, throw light upon ancient manners and customs, fill up gaps and crevices in known histories; and by coins, inscriptions, and architecture, illustrate the forms of ancient civilisation. But the three names, *Jew*, *Greek*, and *Roman*, are associated with all that is reliable in the ancient history of the world; and

Digitized by Google

these, though overlapping and illustrating one another, have their own characteristics. Rome is identified with power, authority, and dominion. No nation has had an equal facility for combination, and rule, for steadfast administration and adherence to law. They are the iron feet of the prophet, which trample into dust the kingdoms and governments of the earth. Their bridges bespanning all rivers, their pantheon containing all kinds of gods, and their roads proceeding from Rome as their centre, and like a spider's web, encircling the globe, illustrate the same characteristics. Power, law, and dominion, are the predominant features of the ancient Romans. Greece, on the other hand, has nobler and higher destinies. They are the true idealists of the world. Their mission is philosophy and free thought. No history is so radiant as theirs with literature, poetry, and science; with philosophy, love of liberty, and heroic deeds. It is truly a starry canopy over the heads of the nations, charming them with its splendours, and pointing the way to greatness and glory. If we owe law to the Romans, we owe light and liberty to the Greeks. They do not coalesce, but divide; they do not submit, but assert independence; they do not stamp law upon the nations with an iron heel, but they subjugate the soul with the beauty of form, with the love of liberty, with the subtlety of mental analysis, with speculations concerning the endless and infinite. We may see Rome typified in the Coliseum, and Greece in the Temple of the Winds; the former shows strength, only strength—the latter beauty, proportion, elegance, an airy architectural idealism, which belongs to the conceptions of no other people.

But the Jews—what are the main characteristics of their nationality and history? They are the bearers of a nobler deposit, the indices of a higher calculus than any other nation. The central idea of their being is not power or beauty, human law and philosophy, but God and truth, and the seed of redemption for humanity. That despised race is the depositary of the life that quickens the nations, of the hopes which shed over us their starry influences, and of the germs of that sacred literature which has filled Christendom with the monuments of imperishable glory. They are in many respects the greatest and most wonderful of all nations, and certainly their influence over the human race has been infinitely more than that of any other nation. For every one that reads Horace, or the songs of Sappho, a hundred thousand read the Psalms of David. Cicero wrote innumerable letters on all subjects, and Demosthenes has given us the noblest of orations; but who reads them—and what influence have they exerted over the nations compared with the fourteen epistles of St. Paul? The strong and the beautiful must yield to the divine. The hills of Palestine and the waters of Shiloh are not naturally lovelier than the seven hills of Rome, or the streams of Helicon; yet, in Jewish history, and in Jewish history alone, we find the unity of God, the history of creation, and the hope of a deliverer. The Jew is a mysterious being. He is related to the infinite and unknown. He is the centre of revelation, and the great idea which fills, perpetuates, and glorifies the nationality is God —the one, living, all-creating, all-comprehending, eternal God. Under his wings they found safety; in him they lived, and moved, and had their being. Not human fame and world dominion, not lofty genius, subtle analysis, and ambitious philosophy; but the divine unity, eternal providence, prophecy and promise, are the golden lines that brighten the texture

Digitized by Google

of their history. Their proper symbol was the temple. Jewish history is to secular history what the Bible is to the literature of Christendom.

2nd. Look away now to the East, and let the eye rest on Ur of the Chaldees, between the Tigris and the Euphrates, and by another great effort contemplate, if you can, the state of the world three thousand nine hundred years ago. You see that old-fashioned cottage, with low doors and a flat roof, and surrounded by all kinds of Oriental fruits and flowers. That old man at the door is Terah, and Mrs. Terah in yon quiet corner is rocking a cradle, which contains Abraham, the father of the faithful and the origin of the Jewish nation. From that little bud the great prophetic tree arose, which is yet, as the branch of the Lord, to flourish and fill the face of the world with fruit. Three thousand nine hundred years the Abrahamic race have occupied a conspicuous part on the theatre of the world; and during that long period, in all conceivable conditions, they have been, in one way or other, the centre of God's working among the kingdoms and nations of the earth. Abraham, Moses, and the Son of David, the three greatest names among men, belonged to them; and all the apostles and prophets of the Old and New Testaments are stars of the firmament of the Holy Land. To them pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; these are the fathers, and of them, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. (Rom. ix. 4, 5.) They were the centre of truth among the tribes and nations of the earth; and from them proceeded almost all the scintillations of fragmentary truth found in the various systems of heathenism. As there is no self-civilising power in man, so there is no power in him in his present state to rise up by native energy to the knowledge of the providence, attributes, and unity of God. The argument "from nature up to nature's God" was true and reliable before the fall, but since that it is false and delusive. The god we arrive at by our reason is a god like ourselves; for without revelation we can never get beyond our ideal. Hence the gods of the heathen were of a mixed character, like the reasoners who formed them; and hence no nation has ever attained the idea of one supreme, holy, eternal God, without revelation.

Now, this is the very doctrine which the Jews manifested to the nations. On the doors of their houses, on the gates of their temples, on all parts of the divine service, was written in flaming lineaments, "The unity of God." It was blended with their personal names, and incorporated in the structure of their language. God was thus preparing in them, and in their institutions, the germs of a great doctrine which was to revolutionise the world. The ideas of sin and atonement, of sacrifice and sabbatical rest, of some supreme power and some kind of future responsibility, dimly discernible among all nations, found in Judæism a local habitation and a name; while the ritual service formed the frame of a splendid typology to embody and illustrate the doctrines of grace. In Abraham we have a type of the nation, as in the nation we have a type of the church. The divine personal call from heathenism, his wanderings all his life long—from Ur to Charan, from Charan to Canaan, from Canaan to Egypt, and thence back again to Canaan—the promises he received, the altars to the true God which he built, the angel-appearances, and such like manifestations of the divine favour to Abraham, showed forth, in the origin and

Digitized by Google

individual, a synopsis of the national history even as that national history embodied, in germ, the main principles which were to be developed under the rays of the Sun of Righteousness. This makes their history and ritual of everlasting importance to the Christians, church, and to all nations.

(1.) As Abraham was the example for personal faith and prompt obedience (Gen. xxii. 18), so the elect nation was the example for all nations; for it is the way of divine providence to educate the race of man by models and specimens.

(2.) This divine typology serves to bind the two covenants into unity, and thereby anticipate the objections of those, in these latter times, who seek to disunite them. Moses and Christ, the Old and the New Testament, can no more be separated than the body and the spirit in a living man. The acorn expanded is the oak, the oak contracted is the acorn; Adam dilated is the human race, the human race contracted is Adam. The Old Testament is Christ under a veil, and the New Testament is Moses unveiled; or, to take another Scripture analogy, Judæaism was the infant inheritor of the promises, and Christianity is the heir come to his majority and entering upon the possession of his estates. (Gal. iv. 1—4.) In like manner Sinai and Sion, bondage and liberty, the law and grace (John i. 17), Hagar and Sarah, the Jerusalem below and the Jerusalem above, shadow forth in types and figures the same close relationship between the Old and the New Testaments. This is the answer to the old Rationalists of Germany and the new Rationalists of England. Those who do not believe Moses reject Christ also. (John v. 46.) Be sure, then, that the divines who reduce the writings of Moses to fictions and fables, calling the Pentateuch a *story*, and its author a mere *story-teller*, have no real faith in the incarnation, divinity, and atonement of Christ. It is as clear as noonday, that in their heart of hearts, these men have no earnest, orthodox, trinitarian faith. "If ye had believed Moses ye would have believed me," and, conversely, if ye believed me ye would believe Moses also.

(3.) For us Christians this typological structure of the Old Testament, which may almost be called its prophetic aspect, is a wide field full of flowers and fruits, of all kinds, ripe and ready for the gatherer's hand. Israel's gorgeous ceremonials, priestly services, fasts, feasts, and festivals, wars, victories and defeats, captivities and restorations, are to the eye, and ear, and heart of faith, a picture-gallery of exquisite beauty, a star-lit canopy inviting us to use the telescope—a luminous dome from which, through thousands of Gothic windows, the beams of the coming deliverer break forth upon us. Is not Egypt the flesh, and the wilderness our redemption condition, and Canaan our heavenly rest? Is not the passover Christ's death (1 Cor. v. 7), and the pentecost his ascension, and the feast of Tabernacles his coming again? Behold the three parts of the temple —the ministering priesthood, their dresses, their censers, their altars, their incense, their silver trumpets, their Sabbaths, their years of release, and their years of jubilee—are not all these, and everything else belonging to their national history, adumbrations of future glories, and, at the same time, stimulants to lead our sluggish minds to enquiry and active thought?

Nor should we forget the main use of this system of typology, which is to relieve the efforts of pure reason, and to supply props and perches for the dove of faith to rest on in her heavenward flight. For since it

Digitized by Google

is a fact that we are not spirits, but *embodied* spirits, so is it equally certain that the objects of faith, the divine realities of the invisible world, can most easily gain our acceptance, and reach our understanding through the objects of sense. We cannot long endure discourse of pure reason. We seek rests, steps, in ascending Jacob's ladder, and flowery arbours where the mind can repose. Hence in revelation the language is frequently figurative, and essentially figurative it must be, or it would be unintelligible. Nor is this the case only in prophecy such as the splendours of Isaiah or the cloudy mysteries of Ezekiel.* The first line of the Lord's Prayer has two figures. When we speak of God and the human soul, and the hopes of the church, and the two advents of the Son of God, we often use metaphors and figures. But remember that figures are not used to obscure, but to illustrate, the meaning. Pure logical ideas, especially on spiritual subjects, are like globes of glass, too round and slippery for our apprehension until the skilful writer or speaker puts handles to them, which he does by means of tropes, and figures, and metaphors of all kinds. It is unfortunate that in these days many expositors *use the handle to break the globe.*

But before leaving this principle of Jewish historical typology, we may extend the field of vision, and with the same eyes of faith contemplate the ordinances of nature and human life; for surely man is a prophet, and there is a prophetic aspect in nature, and the things that have been are indicative of the things that are to be. What are generation, and birth, and education, and food, and sickness, and death, but types of the new birth, the heavenly manna, and the death of the old man within us? Jesus Christ, too, in his manifold offices, has thousands of witnesses in the history of human life, and in the natural world. Is he not the Rock of Ages, and the refuge city, and the heavenly way, and the divine life? The lamb and the lion testify of him. The olive tree and the true vine, the lily of the valley and the rose of Sharon, are his witnesses. He is the root and the offspring of David, the bright and morning star. He is the sun in the firmament of heaven, and the light in the circumambient air. He is all in all, and love delights to find him everywhere; we say, indeed, in general terms, that creation is his work at the beginning; and history is the evolution of his providence ever since, and all nature is but the shadow of his brightness and glory. Let us walk through his world, though now in the possession of another, seeking him and finding him in all things.

3rd. But, in contemplating the history of Israel, we should not forget the amazing *varieties* of their characters and fortunes. As they were intended to be universal witnesses, they must be formed into the capability of performing such great functions. They must, and they do, unite in their nationality all varieties and extremes. They were shepherds and agriculturists, and they are now merchants; their first bondage was long and terrible, and their deliverance mighty and miraculous. They were, under the Judges, six times conquered, and six times delivered by the long-suffering God. Salmaneser conquered and carried away the ten tribes of the kingdom of Samaria, and no man can find them unto the present

* This, of course, does not affect the fact that literal prophecy is to be literally understood as to its fulfilment.

Digitized by Google

time. Judah was seventy years in Babylon, and then restored by a heathen prince. The restored nation, because of their sins and apostacies, suffered the most horrid cruelties from the Persians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans; nor does the history of the world present greater heroism and contempt of life than may be found in the Jewish resistance to Antiochus, under the Maccabean princes. The Greeks against the Persians, the Swiss against Austria, the Dutch against Spain and the bloody Alva, have never, in resolution and steady valour, surpassed the Jewish nation in their struggles against the persecuting Epiphanes. They became free and independent, according to the ancient prophecy (Gen. xlix. 10); but this only led to their rejection of the Son of God, and their consequent world-wide dispersion for eighteen hundred years.

What a history! And they still exist, and are as numerous, perhaps, as in the days of Solomon. They can go through where others must stop; they survive the pangs that others die from. Their history is miraculous, and cannot be judged by the ordinary laws of nature. Their origin, their sufferings, their glories, and their end, are all exceptional, and cannot be measured by the experience of others. No nation has ever suffered such bloody and such long-continued persecutions, and no nation has been fiercer persecutors; nor do I know any instance where, having the power, they have not had the will, to persecute the Christians. While they were the people of God, neither law, nor prophets, nor kings, nor priests, could keep them from idolatry; and since they have been rejected, scattered, and persecuted, they have never anywhere showed the least tendency to worship idols. They are a clever, talented race. I have never met a stupid Jew. They have always some reason to give, or some way of escape from your reasons and arguments. They are fond of luxury and splendour of every kind, and yet they can subsist on less than any others; they are charged with being greedy and grasping, overreaching in business, and avaricious; yet, on great occasions, none ever surpass the Jews in munificence and liberality. They have fewer schools, and less opportunity for acquiring learning, than others, and yet they are a learned people; and as to languages they have no equals; one sacred tongue unites them with the past, with Jerusalem, with the kingdom of David and Solomon; and they communicate with the nations in every language which contains vocables for pedlar and merchant, profit and loss. In boundary districts and mixed nationalities, they are mediators and interpreters; so that their lingual acquirements are often turned to good account. They unite in a wonderful manner both fanaticism and free thinking; and while by nature aristocratic and conservative in the highest degree, they are yet among the steadiest and most advanced leaders of democracy in Europe. Firm and unyielding as to their ends, and yet wonderfully yielding and subtle as to the means of obtaining them, they have survived and triumphed over the persecutions of ages. We may say, finally, that all possible extremes meet in them, and yet so meet and blend that the true Jewish type remains uneffaced and uneffacable. He is still the Jew in thought and feeling, as he still bears the dark eyes, and the Abrahamic features.

4th. But we must now turn our attention to another aspect of Jewish history, and that is the *prophecies fulfilled in it.* This is but another part of the great scheme of providence which makes, and has ever made, the Jewish nation a standing witness for God upon the earth. From the call

Digitized by Google

of Abraham to the advent of Christ—a long period of two thousand years—the Jews were the only witnesses on earth for the unity, spirituality, and worship of the true God. Then, again, from their dispersion among the nations during the last eighteen hundred years, they are witnesses for the living God in many ways. Their being scattered after the crucifixion, demonstrates the Messiahship of Jesus, and when you ask a Jew, "Why are you not in your own land?" he can give you no answer. The blood of the Messiah is on his head, and he cannot reply. Then, again, their remaining eighteen hundred years scattered among the nations, and yet not blended with them, demonstrates very clearly that God has some great purpose in store for them, and that all his gracious promises shall in due time be fulfilled.

But the main and the mightiest testimony borne by the Jews is the fulfilment of prophecy of which they are in a great degree at once the depositaries and the objects.

Let us trace very briefly, and by way of specimen, merely a few of the prophecies that have been fulfilled in that ancient nation. Gen. xii. 1 was fulfilled, and Abraham became a *great nation.* Gen. xiii. 14—18 was fulfilled in them, and they were brought into the *promised* land. Gen. xv. was literally fulfilled, and *Isaac* became the heir of the promises. Gen. xv. 13—16 was fulfilled in them, and according to the sure record of the prophecy (1), they did become *strangers*; (2), and they *did* serve as *slaves,* and (3), they *were* afflicted four hundred years; and (4), God did *judge* their oppressors; and (5), they *did* come out of Egypt with great substance. And, be it remembered, all these events were predicted four hundred years before the fulfilment. Is not this a proof of the inspiration of the pentateuch? Gen. xxii. 18 is fulfilled, and being fulfilled, and shall eventually be fulfilled to the letter. Jesus is the promised *seed,* and in him all the nations shall be blessed. The vision of *Jacob's Ladder* has been fulfilled, and is fulfilling, in Jesus Christ the mediator, in whom angels and men, and the whole creation of God, are headed up and harmonised (Eph. i. 10); though, like many symbolical prophecies, it may have a perfect fulfilment in the millennial ages. Read Leviticus, and you find everywhere types, and shadows, and prophetic symbols that have their fulfilment in Christ and the gospel times. Read the Psalms, and you will find them teeming with the cross, and the crown, the first and second advent, the gospel dispensation, and the millennial glory. Psa. ii. is the kingdom and the Sonship; Psa. viii. his incarnation and subsequent coronation; Psa. xvi. is his resurrection; Psa. xxii. his crucifixion; Psa. xxiii. is just John x. anticipated; Psa. xl. is his assumption of the servant form which Paul developes in Phil. ii.; Psa. xcvi. and xcviii. are the new songs sung by a jubilant world in anticipation of the coming of the Lord; and Psa. xcvii. and xcix. are his reign of righteousness on the earth; Psa. cii. 13—16 is in fact the same prophecy concerning the conversion of Israel at the coming of Christ, which Paul represents Rom. xi. 26; Psa. cx. is the majesty, kingdom, and priesthood of Jesus Christ; Psa. cii. 25 (Heb. i. 10—12), asserts the divinity, eternity, unchangeability, and creatorship of the Son of God; In Psa. lxviii. 18 you have the ascension of Christ, and the coming of the Holy Ghost; and in Psa. l. you have a delineation of his coming and kingdom. These are some of the more Messianic psalms, but the believing heart finds Jesus in them all. He is, indeed, the

Digitized by Google

substance of all the Scriptures. Read Isaiah, and you will find the doctrinal, the historical, and the prophetical harmoniously blended together, but still so that the great centre of all is Christ. His birth Isa. ix. 6; his miraculous generation, vii. 14; his godhead, vi. 1—4, John xii. 41; his baptism, xi. 2; his uniting Jew and Gentile, xi. 10; his sufferings and crucifixion, liii; his righteous reign, lx., lxv., 17—25. These are only samples of the splendid predictions which have justly entitled Isaiah to the name of the evangelical prophet. We pass by Jeremiah and the mysteries of Ezekiel, because their prophecies are mostly unfulfilled; and with a brief notice of Daniel, we conclude this part of the subject. What an idea does it give of the presence of the holy Inspirer, that by means of four metals in the construction of an image, he should give us a broad chart of prophetic chronology, including the four universal monarchies, the apostacy and its destruction by the kingdom of the *stone*. (Dan. ii. 31—45)? As to space, it embraces the world; as to time, it takes in the whole period from Nebuchadnezzar to the second coming of Christ. How wonderfully suggestive and characteristic are the four beasts (vii), representing the same monarchies as the metals, and introducing, as before, the kingdom of the Son of man with the clouds of heaven!

But on these splendid symbols we cannot dwell. We feel always in this prophet that we are in a great and sublime presence, before which the proudest, noblest intellect can only worship and adore. All is solemn, comprehensive, symbolical, universal, embracing all time, and space, and human dominion, and like all the other prophets, his great central theme around which all things else revolve, is the coming and the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. But Israel, as seen in history, is like a vine from Egypt, which sends forth his branches to the ends of the earth. His testimony is almost universal. Where is there a kingdom which he does not touch, a tyrannic and apostate nation where his prophetic voice is not heard? What prophecies have we fulfilled in Babylon and the four monarchies; in Jerusalem, Judea, and the Jews; in Christ and Antichrist; in the church and the apostacy, and in particular cities and nations, as Ammon, Moab, Idumea, Philistia, Tyre, and Egypt! In many different ways, in all circumstances, and to all surrounding states and nations, did the ancient prophetic people bear aloft their testimony to the unity of God, the hope of a coming deliverer, the reward of the righteous, and the certain destruction of the ungodly.

5th. But what are some of the lessons which Israel in history is calculated to teach?

(1.) We learn the great truth taught in Rev. xix. 10, that the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. Many things, all things in a certain sense, testify of him, but the great special testimony is the spirit of prophecy. The Jewish history is a vast chronometer, on which the prophetic index points out the hour of time as it passes, and with strokes louder than thunder announces to the guilty nations their predestined doom. It is a frame of divine wormanship. The moving power is God, the dial-plate is time, the hand always points to eternity, and the proprietor and regulator of it is the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom the moments, the minutes, and the hours have their eternal home.

(2.) We learn, secondly, the relations which the Old Testament bears to the New. We see one design of the blessed God running through all

Digitized by Google

covenants and dispensations in which the living and sustaining centre is Christ. We see also how the dispensations are formed to suit the two-fold nature of man, the spiritual and the corporeal, having always the treasure of spiritual grace accompanied by certain outward marks or visible signs; thus the covenant of Adam had the two trees for signs, that of Noah the rainbow, that of Abraham circumcision, that of Moses the Sabbath, and the new covenant has the signs and seals of baptism and the Lord's Supper. This radical division of outward and inward may be traced in all language by its very nature, in all types and figures, in the pillar and cloud having the divine presence and the sign, all of which scattered rays meet, and are perfected in the person of the Incarnate God, in whom the divine majesty was overshadowed by the human tabernacle. (John i. 14). (Greek). You see, then, how close the connection is between the Old and New Testaments—it is the relation between the acorn and the oak, the bud and the flower, the servant and the son, the heir in nonage and the heir in his majority, the promise and the fulfilment, Hagar's son and Isaac, the Jerusalem in bondage with her children, and the Jerusalem which is free, which is the mother of us all.

(3.) What more do we learn from Israel in history? We learn something of the principle of prophetic interpretation, for surely the past is the best teacher of the future. As God has done in the past, so may we expect him to do in future; as he has fulfilled prophecies in the past, so will he fulfil them in future; and this is the very rule of interpretation established in Isa. xi. 11—16, where the restoration of Israel from all lands is to be like the restoration from the land of Egypt. How were the prophecies fulfilled which refer to the incarnation, life, death, and glorification of Jesus Christ? So literally, so exactly may we expect the prophecies to be fulfilled which refer to his second coming, the resurrection of the just, the calling of the Jews, and the reign of the glorified saints with Jesus. (Rev. v.) The question of interpretation never is and never can be, Are there figures of speech in the prophecies? but *how far* they are to be taken in a figurative sense? What is the meaning couched under them? The best guide we have for the interpretation of the unfulfilled Scriptures is the Lord's method in those that are fulfilled.

(4.) The last lesson we shall at present draw from the history of Israel is that of unity in plurality, or "the many in the one," as God's method in providence and grace, of dealing with the human family. We were all created in one, we all fell in one, we were all delivered from the deluge in one, we were all redeemed in one. A whole nation was blessed in Shem, and a whole nation was cursed in Ham, and the ancient word (Gen. xvi. 12.) is manifested in the wandering Arabs of the present time. We were not like the angels, created all at once in our distinct personalities by the fiat of Jehovah, but in a head and fountain, and hence paternity, filiation, brotherhood, are purely human relations, and except in so far as they are seen in God, are seen nowhere else in creation. In him are found paternity and sonship, and these are imaged forth in the human race alone. Hence the principle of "the many in the one;" hence the possibility of atonement, redemption, and imputation. We suffer with and for one another; we are by nature and necessity bound up in all things by the principle of headship, which is another form of "The many in the one." Adam was a head, Noah was a head, Abraham was a head, every father is a head, the king is

Digitized by Google

the head ruler, and, over all and uniting all, Jesus Christ is the head of the church (Eph. v. 23); the head of the human race (1 Cor. xi. 3); the head of the angels (1 Pet. iii. 22); and the head of the whole creation (Eph. i. 21—23, 10). This is the very principle and basis of atonement, which, far from being an exception to the ordinary dealings of providence, is the highest and noblest manifestation of them. This great principle is another lesson clearly seen in the history of Israel.

OBJECTIONS TO UNIVERSAL RESTORATION.

DEAR SIR,

Sydney Smith used to say, that "it was a great mistake to read a book before you reviewed it; it interfered so much with the freedom of one's criticism." Your critic, Mr. Constable, has more than once of late reminded me of this joke of the old reviewer. Forgetting the rule, "Be sure you see, before you pretend to oversee," unintentionally, we must believe, but no less really, he has used your pages to misrepresent others. How entirely he misrepresented Origen, in your April number, I took the liberty to show you in a letter which I sent you on the fifth of that month, which you then declined to publish, but which I yet think would be of interest to some of your readers. Since then Mr. Dunn has shown how much Mr. Constable has both misunderstood and misrepresented him. And now, last and least, I have to beg a little space, to recall your attention to some of the charges which you have allowed Mr. Constable to make against me in your last number.

And here, as I do not care to notice what appear to be mere misconceptions, I will say nothing of Mr. Constable's often repeated statement, that I make the doctrine of "man's inalienable immortality" the basis of my hope of universal restoration,—when on the contrary I have distinctly stated, that "God only hath immortality,"—because, as I have also declared that I believe man will exist for ever, Mr. Constable may really not be able to see how a mortal creature may exist for ever, or how the final and blessed restoration of a mortal creature, which will yet exist for ever, depends not on its existing for ever, but on its participation with Christ in death and resurrection. But is it reviewing or false accusing to say, as Mr. Constable says, that I "quietly shut out the doctrine of the primitive church and of Scripture, namely, immortality in and through Christ;" ("quietly," I suppose, lest my wrong doing should be detected; but Mr. Constable is too acute to let me escape;) when not only the whole burden of my book is to show that only through participation in Christ's death and resurrection can we obtain eternal life, but when further I have distinctly said, in so many words, "Christ is, and must be, the one and only way by which any have been, or are, or can be, saved;" (p. 97;) and when yet more, as Mr. Constable himself is witness, I quote

Digitized by Google

the words, "So in Christ shall all be made alive," to prove (what Mr. Constable in answer asserts they do not prove,) the salvation and resurrection, in and through Christ, of all men. Just imagine the charge:—Mr. Jukes erroneously quotes, "So in Christ shall all be made alive;" and yet Mr. Jukes "quietly shuts out the doctrine of immortality in and through Christ."

Again, is it reviewing or false accusing to say, that I "suppose my theory is the only rival to that of the vulgar hell;" and again, that I "advance it *as the only opponent to that of Augustine and his school*," (the italics here are Mr. Constable's,) when he is himself the witness that I not only refer to his own notion of the final non-being of the wicked, but further show why I cannot receive it as the true solution of the mystery. Again, is it reviewing or false accusing to say that Mr. Jukes "tells his readers that if they do not accept his theory, they must fall back upon that view of the second death, which makes it consist in never-ending torments. Will Mr. Constable quote the passage where Mr. Jukes "tells his readers" this? Where have I ever said what my readers must do "if they do not accept my theory"? The charge is first and last without foundation, just as the next also is, that I "intentionally," or unintentionally,* "use the word 'annihilation' as a little rhetorical artifice." Is this, I ask, the way to investigate truth? Will such reviewing as this help any to the true solution of the secret of God's purpose?

For the question between us really is, Is death the end of man's being, or is it not rather the strait and narrow gate which sinners must pass to resurrection? What Mr. Constable contends for is, that the second death is the utter end of man's existence; that in this death, to use his own words, "the organized being composed of spirit and body has ceased to exist . . . that which constitutes identity, whatever that is, is gone." What I contend for is, that man's death, whether of spirit or body, or of both, does not destroy "that which constitutes identity;" that whether we are dead in sins or dead to sin, though there may be the death of one old man and the birth of another new man in us, whatever the death may be, the being in whom this happens remains through all the same person. The saints, who are first-fruits of creation, by death and dissolution have not lost that which constitutes their identity. They are the same persons, even though they have been "turned to destruction" by God, and are to "come again children of men," that is new creatures, in Christ Jesus.

This is really the point at issue; not whether "man is by nature an immortal being;" but whether, being mortal, and destroyed, and judged, and dead in the worst of deaths, death, and judgment, and destruction, is, or is not, the way to deliver him. I say it is. And it is clear to me that the mistake, of those who think that death is God's end for the wicked and impenitent, arises from their not seeing the needs-be for law and its attendant condemnation, and that death and judgment are the sinner's way to salvation and resurrection. They do not see that the misery of the wicked is that they have not here died to sin with Christ; that, therefore, at the death of the body, they are still in the life and sphere, and so within the power, of the wrathful dark-world. Hence they do not

* Mr. Constable's paper says, "*intentionally*," (printed in italics,) but I fancy, from the context, he meant to say *unintentionally*; at all events I give him the benefit of the doubt.

Digitized by Google

see how the second death may be a necessary condition towards the fulfilment of the promise, "I make all things new;" a chaos being always the preparation for a new creation. They are right in asserting that man is mortal, and that immortality is only in and through our Lord Jesus. They are wrong in concluding from this that the death and destruction of the wicked is therefore non-being, or that God can only save men through Christ in this present life. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead, who for their sins suffer the judgment of the second death; when we know that it is only "by death that He destroys him that has the power of death, that is, the devil," and that the lost continue to be lost, because they have not here died with Christ, and therefore are not delivered out of that power of darkness, in which, till we so die, we all are held captive.

Of course these brethren may say that they do not see this. But they make poor discoverers who conclude there is no land when they discern nothing but sea. The fact is, it is in God's household as it is in ours. There are in every house purposes and arrangements of parental love, which, though clear enough to some of the elder children, are unknown to, or very imperfectly understood by, the younger members of the family, and of course utterly beyond the capacity of baby in the cradle, who yet in his helplessness, perhaps, practically rules the house. When, therefore, these brethren tell us that in the death and destruction of the wicked they can see nothing beyond such death and destruction, or when, further, they charge those who look for universal restoration with "quietly shutting out the doctrine of immortality in and through Christ," and with holding that the doctrine of universal restoration "rests on the basis of the supposed immortality of all men," they simply tell us their present status in the family. They will know better by and bye.

One word more. There may be some readers of the *Rainbow* who may like to hear direct from me what I do hold as to future restoration. Briefly, my view is this: First, that it is God's will by a first-born seed, "the first-born from the dead," to save and bless the later-born; that in this seed, which is Christ's body, all the kindreds of the earth shall be blessed; the elect being the means, in God's hand, to reach and save others. Secondly, that this will of God is only worked out through successive ages or dispensations, or, to use the language of St. Paul, "according to the purpose of the ages;" the times and seasons of the law, especially the times which make up the jubilee, being the type or shadow of the ages of the gospel. And, thirdly, that in fulfilling this purpose, it is God's will, who thus and thus only, meets the peculiar nature of our fall and departure from Him, to make death, judgment, and destruction, the means and way, as we see in the cross, to life, acquittal, and salvation. Such are my views, and I give the reasons for them in my little volume on *The Second Death.*

In the full assurance that one true thought, when once expressed, is stronger than ten thousand pulpits or leading articles which teach error, I again commend my thoughts to your consideration, with an earnest prayer, that, as the days get darker around us, the *Rainbow* may shine with a brighter lustre.

Yours, &c.,

Highgate. ANDREW JUKES.

Digitized by Google

LETTERS ON THEMES OF DEEPEST MOMENT.

Sextus Calpurnius to his dearest Mother, greeting.

V.

NOT yet have I received your long-expected letter; but at this season of the year the conveyance of our despatches is precarious, especially from these less important provinces. It is a marvel that a system of couriers is not instituted from province to province. Of course the expense of maintenance would be very costly; but the aggregate number of despatches from the many procurators, and from the different proconsuls, would materially reduce the expense; if they could be made to flow as it were into a few channels converging towards Rome. You cannot have forgotten that such a plan was brought before the Senate by Marcus Ambivius, and suggested to the mind of this senator by my dear father, on his return home through proconsular Asia.

Since my last letter much has transpired, and is in the course of transpiring, that is of thrilling interest to us all, who are concerned in the fortunes of Jesus of Nazareth.

I left my dear Jehoiada at Capernaum, at the house of Simon Barjona; for I was obliged to go northward on military duties to Cæsarea Philippi. This is another of those Roman towns and colonies, springing up in this province; it is in the tetrarchy of Herod Philip, built and dedicated by him to the honour of our Emperor. It is on the route from Jerusalem to Damascus, is romantically situated near the source of the Jordan river; and perhaps is remarkable for nothing except the beauty of its situation. Not far away stood the ancient city of Laish, which formed so conspicuous a feature in the history of Israel under her judges. About the time of the Trojan war, it was taken by a company of adventurers belonging to the tribe of Dan, and thenceforward the city bore the name of Dan, their common father. It formed the most northerly bound of the land of Israel; even as Beersheba was its southern extremity: hence the phrase 'from Dan to Beersheba' denotes the whole extent of the land. 'Twas in a grove on the mountain close to this city of Dan, that the arch-rebel Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, set up a calf of gold, wherewith he estranged the hearts of his new subjects from the worship of Jehovah. Another idol-calf was set up at Bethel, at the other extremity of his kingdom. The policy of this bold act was to prevent his people of the ten revolted tribes, from going up to the grand temple of Jerusalem. He justly feared lest by mingling three times a year in the imposing ritual of that grand service, with the men of Judah and Benjamin, they might be weaned from their allegiance to himself, a usurper of the throne of Solomon the Magnificent, and David the beloved of all. Jehoiada afterwards informed me that Bar-Nebat borrowed this symbol of the calf from Egypt, whither he had fled an exile; and where, as you well know, the bull is still worshipped with mystic rites. Ah! little did the princely Solomon imagine, when he was dedicating that most magnificent fane to the worship of Jehovah, that within a few brief years, full three-fourths of his leal subjects would be

Digitized by Google

alienated altogether from Israel's Jehovah, from his temple, from his service.

The scenery on the upper Jordan is most beautiful; on the east is Trachonitis, and most appropriately does it bear this name; for the country is *rough*, and the people are as *rough* as the soil is rugged. I am delighted with the valley of the Lebanon; it far exceeds in beauty our Apennine vales. You know my boldness in adventure; I longed to scale the lofty Hermon; what a prospect would there be from its summit! But at this winter season the ascent is impossible; so I left the eagle to his eyrie home undisturbed. I was absent on this excursion about fifteen days; but judge of my intense disappointment, when I found on returning to Capernaum that during my short absence the Shiloh had been there, and had left; he is supposed to be visiting those ten cities to the south of the lake, which bear the Greek name, Decapolis. I found also that all my friends were gone, except Leonatus. Yes! Jehoiada was gone. The Master had summoned to a mountain to the north of the town some seventy of his most trusty disciples; then he gave a most solemn charge; gave them rules for their conduct, and instructions to proclaim that his kingdom is nigh; he charged them to urge upon all repentance for sins, and to proclaim pardon through trust in his own name. Thus much Leonatus informed me; and that they had gone forth two by two, and would not return until they had traversed the whole land. He also told me that our dear friend Jehoiada had gone to the Samaritans with a young man named Lucas, a native of Syrian Antioch. I at once resolved to return to Cæsarea, or Strato's tower, where I first landed, and there to set things thoroughly in order that I might be able to visit Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover, which will be at the very next full moon. At Cæsarea I found things admirably ordered by my trusty Cornelius. He is a devout man, and one that fears Jehovah with all his house, who gives much alms to the poor, and prays continually to Israel's God. I cannot write in terms of sufficient commendation, either of him or of Leonatus: it really is my experience that the expectancy of Israel's Shiloh works such an influence upon the life, that each individual becomes a better man, a better citizen of the world, a better servant, a better master. These two men are the heroes of their respective companies, and yet, more strict disciplinarians, more skilful officers there are not in the whole of our Roman legions.

I had not been above a day or two at Cæsarea, before I heard of the two heralds of the Shiloh; they had been in many of the neighbouring villages of Samaria, proclaiming the kingdom of Emmanuel. The last Sabbath they had spent at Sebaste, the Samaria of our Hebrew rolls, and the former capital of the ten revolted tribes. The next Sabbath they were to be at Sychar, or Sichem, as these Samaritans call it. The old name, the correct name is Shechem, but these people cannot pronounce the *sh*, but give it the sound of our *s*. When I noticed this to my friend Jehoiada, he told me how the men of Ephraim, who inhabited these parts were detected by this peculiarity in their pronunciation. In a conflict with their neighbours of Gilead, they were worsted; and when they fled they were caught at the passages of the river Jordan; and each was asked to pronounce the word Shibboleth, and when he said Sibboleth, he was known to be an Ephraimite, and was slain: it was said that forty and two thousand paid the penalty of inability to pronounce the Hebrew letter Schin. How remarkable it is, my dear mother, that peculiar dialects seem to remain in

Digitized by Google

the same locality from age to age. The incident I have just alluded to, occurred in the time of the war between Greece and Troy; thus this sibilation has clung to this region for nearly twelve centuries; and this is the more remarkable, as a different race of people was transplanted hither about the time of the foundation of Rome, by the Assyrians from the East. What a fact is this for our philological friend, Quintus Hortensius.

On the next 'preparation' *(paraskeue,* which you will remember is the day before the Sabbath), Cornelius and I set forth from Cæsarea; and an hour before sunset, or the commencement of the Sabbath, we were comfortably quartered in the chief hostelry of this most ancient city. I felt a peculiar veneration for the old place, which had figured in the story of the patriarchs, Abraham, and Jacob. Early the next morning we were excited by crowds of citizens thronging to the gate of their city. Here you must know is an open space answering to our Italian pomœria, but serving all the purposes of our forum: public sales are effected here; public assemblies (conciones) are held here: here too courts of justice are open; hence clients are said to speak with their opponents (adversarii) *in the gate;* the magistrates of a city are said to be its *gates.* Hither at eventide may the people be seen congregating after their evening meal in the glorious summer time to hear of some new thing; and hither also flocked on this eventful Sabbath these Sycharenes to hear new things indeed, good news of goodwill to mankind. Hither, too, we Romans bent our steps, and there amid that dense throng, hushed into breathless silence, stood the venerable Jehoiada, with his majestic presence, his snow-white beard lending additional grace to his noble bearing; by his side was the youthful Lucas of Syrian Antioch; and the contrast between them twain seemed to give yet more interest to the picture, so full of beauty to me.

First, Lucas read passages out of the Samaritan Scriptures, with an eloquence which Jehoiada only could have surpassed; then followed prayers adapted to this grand occasion, poured forth from the overflowing heart of that youthful saint: oh! how different from those cold formal prayers to which I have listened in many a synagogue. Then came forward our own Jehoiada; and from the five books of Moses he spoke to these Samaritans; opening and alleging that this is the very juncture for the appearing of the Shiloh, who is to crush the head of the serpent foe; that the sceptre was at length wrenched from the grasp of Judah; when the rule of the house of Judah, and of the Asmonœan race have alike ceased—when a star hath arisen out of Jacob, as sang the prophet bard as he gazed from the heights of Abarim, upon this very land, and beheld these very times—then he related of that heavenly light that appeared unto princely sages in his eastern home far, far away, a new thing in the firmament of the heavens; then he told us how this meteor-fire was followed by some of these wise ones from this far-off land, who left home, and kindred, and houses, and lands, and friendships, all, to follow its guiding light; that like unto the glory in the wilds of Sinai and Paran, it led them over barren solitudes, over mountain ranges, through tribes unknown speaking various dialects, and worshipping deities as various; onward, onward still it guided them until it reached this very land—that as the Shekinah-cloud in its progress rested over the tabernacle ever and anon, so this heavenly guide rested over the very home wherein was born the Babe, who now appeared unto them as the Shiloh, the Anointed One of Jehovah: 'This

Digitized by Google

very Shiloh,' he exclaimed, 'has been amongst yourselves, has preached to you in this very place, and has told you of the deep things of God. There is one in this assembly whose whole career of crime he at once laid bare to view; there are others who have believed in him as the very prophet that should come into the world. Like unto Moses he is skilled in mysteries divine; like unto Moses, he feeds thousands with the bread multiplied abundantly; nay, far superior to Moses, he multiplies this provision at his own will. Did he not move as an incarnated conscience amidst your very selves, revealing your inner thoughts, searching the very purposes of the heart, and exposing to full view the secrets of your lives? Like unto Moses, in whom ye trust, he now brings down the will of your Father in heaven, even good-will to men. He reveals to you that the time is at hand, yea, at your very doors, when neither at Jerusalem, nor on this Mount Gerizim, shall men worship the Father, that the whole world shall be his temple; the firmament of heaven shall be the separating veil screening the true holy of holies; behind this veil, curiously wrought with its multitudinous constellations, sitteth Jehovah on the throne of majesty, a throne of grace, the true mercy-seat. God is a Spirit; he is anywhere, everywhere, yea, wherever there is a heart to worship him in spirit and in truth.'

How can I do justice to his fervid oratory? all listened in ravished attention; but by not one in that vast throng were his words drunk in with such eager thirst as by your own Sextus Calpurnius. Towards the close of his discourse the old man was expatiating on the claims of their loyalty, when he caught sight of us poor Gentiles, and exclaimed, in the language of the Shiloh (as he assured me afterwards), 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, from the north and from the south, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of God.' The peroration was truly grand; and this discourse must have led captive the judgment of listening thousands. When he had finished, the elders of the city approached, greeted him most warmly, and said, 'We will hear thee again upon this matter.' He accordingly appointed the following Sabbath for another such assembly.

Soon afterwards, Jehoiada and his companion joined us at our hostelry, and we spent the rest of the Sabbath in searching our Scriptures, and reading therein the prophetic portraiture of the Shiloh of Jehovah.

Now let me write a few words of the youthful companion of Jehoiada on this mission. He was a slave, a native of Syrian Antioch, a freedman of my father's *quondam* friend Lucanus, whose name he bears in an abbreviated form in remembrance. He showed great promise; especially was he skilful in medicine, and the art of painting—hence his master had him trained most carefully, and he was of great service to his master. On his death, Lucanus bequeathed Lucas to his own self, yes! set him free, and made him his own master. Since his freedom, Lucas has been exercising his skill, throughout the Lebanon and northern Galilee: he tells me that he was first led to trust in Jesus as the Shiloh, by witnessing his miracles of healing which are truly divine. He assures me that in almost every case the patient was incurable, and in each case the individual healed was at once restored to perfect health, without any weary interval of gradual convalescence. He told me that he was chosen to go to the Samaritans, because he was a Gentile, and that Jehoiada was chosen because he was

Digitized by Google

known throughout Samaria to have avowed his conviction that neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncirumcision: he assures me that the Shiloh is most careful lest offences should arise; and hence he would not send his Galilean Jews into the cities of Samaria. Through Jehoiada, Lucas and I are already attached friends; and should any evil befal my dear old friend, I feel that I shall ever have in Lucas a friend in very deed. He calls me Theophilus; for he observes most beautifully, the freedman of Jehovah must receive his benefactor's name: I would earn this his title of 'the *God-loving*,' by my devoted loyalty to Jehovah and his Shiloh.

Jehoiada has astonished me not a little by reading to me a letter, which he has just received from his friend Nicodemus, one of the members of the great Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. The news will indeed startle you. The letter states that a well-known Scribe at Bethany, Eliezer by name, at whose house the Shiloh has been a frequent and a most welcome guest, had fallen sick and died; that on the fourth day after his death the Shiloh came to Bethany with his apostles, to comfort the bereaved family. The letter goes on to say that though Eliezer had been so long dead, yet he is alive again; and that our Shiloh, in whom we trust, hath raised him from the grave. 'What!' said I, 'after being so long dead; why, corruption must have commenced in the fluids and solids of the corpse!' But Jehoiada asked in reply, Is anything too hard for Jehovah? 'Then why did you not relate this grandest of miracles to the Sycharenes in your discourse to them?' He replied that he had two reasons; he wished to confine their attention to the evidence of fulfilled prophecies concerning the Shiloh; but the second, the chief reason was contained in the sequel of the letter. The writer went on to say that the Pharisees were so confounded by so notable a miracle, wrought so close to the metropolis, and upon a person so well-known as Eliezer, that they had convoked a council; that not a few of them were plotting to put Eliezer to death yet once again, but as some dreaded that their victim might be restored to life a second time, they had determined that the Nazarene himself must die. 'What!' I exclaimed, 'are your people capable of such dæmoniacal wickedness! The power of my country shall interpose: my faithful legionaries shall be mustered; we will intercept their plots; these conspirators shall be arrested and arraigned at Pilate's judgment-seat.' 'Ah!' said Jehoiada, 'these crafty Pharisees are too wary not to have provided against any successful interposition; for they are framing an accusation; and the indictment upon which our Shiloh is to be arraigned, is that he is setting up claims of sovereignty, rival to the claims of Cæsar.' 'What!' said I, 'can this be the charge of Pharisees, who hate our Roman domination with such a deadly hate.' 'Yes!' he rejoined; 'they know the character of your Roman governor; they are endeavouring to work upon his fears.' My dear mother, you can form little conception of the truckling pusillanimity of our procurator! I did not pass any remark upon him, even to Jehoiada; but the dear good man must have witnessed the blush of indignant shame that suffused my countenance! I replied, 'But though the sect of the Pharisees be powerful, and perhaps in the ascendant, yet the nation at large must rise against them and vindicate the claims of their greatest Benefactor!' Jehoiada again met me with the assurance, that these hypocrites had even entered into a league with their own

Digitized by Google

bitterest enemies in a plot against the life of Jesus—with those whom you would have deemed their irreconcilable foes—even the Herodians! 'What!' I gasped out, 'what! with those degraded slaves, those besotted wretches, who have sunk so low as to flatter the monster Herod with the title of the Anointed One! but how will they be able to silence the indignant clamours of the people at large?' Here again my friend had his rejoinder ready; 'Our high priest, Caiaphas, has uttered a prediction;' 'It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.' Of this oracular dictum they are making use for their own ends.' 'But 'tis time that we, who profess to be the friends of Jesus as our Shiloh should rally round him! let us find him; let us warn him; let me take him under my own particular charge. In this country of the Samaritans, he must be safe. Sebaste, Sychar, Cæsarea, all the villages round about, will most gladly receive a Shiloh, who has been rejected by their Jewish enemies.' 'Nay,' replied my friend, 'the Shiloh has resolved to go up to Jerusalem; he most firmly withstood all attempts to dissuade him; never has he been so moved, as when opposing these kindliest intentions of his friends. He said to Simon (alluding to the name, which he had given him, Cephas, πετρος, a *little stone*), Thou art a *stone* of *stumbling* unto Me. He has on two or three several occasions spoken of his own death!' 'Alas! alas!' I exclaimed, 'Is he really to die! are his enemies to prevail? are their dark designs to prosper? Truly this is an age of dæmoniacal possessions; dæmons of evil are leading your nation to its downfall!' 'You describe us but too truly,' said the dear old man, with a deep sigh. 'But our regeneration is at hand! He hath charged us on this our mission to proclaim that his kingdom is nigh at hand! Who shall say that the dying of the Shiloh is not to be the life of the nation; even as our High Priest hath proclaimed. The younger son of Zebedee and I were talking over these very matters, when he assured me that the Master had uttered these momentous words, 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.' At the last Feast of Tabernacles, when he was addressing the Jews, I caught the words, 'When ye shall have *lifted up* the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am he.' Even from that time have I been pondering over these momentous words. Does not our prophet speak of him as *wounded, bruised, stricken, cut off* out of the land of the living'? So much was I astonished and overwhelmed with this thrilling news, that I could not pursue the conversation any farther.

There is evidently much more in the teaching of the Shiloh than I have ever dreamed of—but even if he perish, even without setting up his kingdom, yet will I trust in him as the Anointed One of Jehovah.

* * * * * * * *

Mayst thou live and fare well.

A. U. C. 786. *Prid. Kal. Martis.*

Digitized by Google

THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOUR THOUSAND AND THEIR SONG.

(Outline suggestions.)

REV. XIV. 3.

THE gracious word of *Rev. i.* 3 is sufficient warrant for our pondering the wonders of this book; and, as did Mary in relation to the first revelation of the Lord, laying them up in our hearts.

This fourteenth chapter is one of three, occupying a central part of the book, which are entirely of a recurrent character, at least they appear so to be.

We would suggest the following *analysis*. *Rev. i.* :—the vision of the Saviour to the apostle. *Rev. ii. & iii.* :—the letters to the churches, containing "the things which are" concerning the churches, consecutive, yet concurrent circumstances.

The following, viii. Rev. 4 *to* 11, inclusive:—the first part of the narrative of the solemn events of the day of the Lord, for the space of three years and a half, during which the Antichrist reigns, the nations are afflicted and God's judgments are poured out; with one or two digressive chapters of circumstances occurring during that period, as Rev. vii., which is a record of the sealed Jews and the securing of the harvest. Probably to take place just before the opening of the seventh seal.

Rev. xii. xiii. xiv. are, seemingly, of a recurrent character.

The twelfth indicates great events to occur just before the manifestation of the Antichrist, and apparently a little while before the professing church gives birth to the Man-child, which Man-child, representing the raised, sleeping, and living waiting ones, whilst Satan is watching to devour it, is caught up to the presence of Christ, and Satan is cast down upon the earth.

The thirteenth manifests the Beast, the Antichrist energised by the devil, with his workings and persecutions during his reign.

The fourteenth exhibits the Lamb and his workings, from the commencement to the close of the same era.

Then in the following, viii. Rev., 15 *to* 22, we have a continuation of the narrative of the solemn events, only broken by the digressive chapters xvii. xviii., which relate to Babylon and her destruction.

Thus the book divides itself into two equal parts.

This fourteenth chapter, we have said, developes the workings of the Lamb in contrast to those of the Beast, of the thirteenth—containing an account of the rapture of the first-fruits; the ministry of the gospels to all nations, coincident with the opening of the first seal; the other special ministrations of warning against worshipping the Beast, or bearing his mark, with the fearful end of those who shall do so; then the gathering of the harvest, the number which no man could number, first alluded to in

Digitized by Google

chapter vii.; and then the reaping of the vintage, to be fulfilled in the last terrible destruction of the gathered nations, by the appearance of the Redeemer, as recorded, *Rev. xix.* 11.

We now consider more particularly the text.

I. *The singers—who?* The 144,000 in the presence of the Saviour, before the commencement of the three-and-a-half years of the Antichrist's reign.

A distinct body from those of Rev. vii., *those* are the sealed from among the Jews during the time of tribulation; *these,* we suggest, are the waiting, watchful Christians, who shall be caught away from the great tribulation, according to the Saviour's promise. (Rev. iii. 10.)

The changed living at Christ's coming alluded to in 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; and referred to in Matt. xxiv. 38—41.

The changed *living, only,* and therefore probably only part of the great number who now ascend into the Saviour's presence; the raised from the dead not numbered with them, *on account* of this chapter taking notice only of the living actors upon earth, when the Lord's presence is set in the heavens only, and his day begins; but in the twelfth chapter, and in the Man-child, we may consider both included; the living only here; *they* are said to be "redeemed from the earth"—would not this imply that they were kept from the grave, not permitted to taste of death? *and also,* "redeemed from among men," implying that they were caught up from among the living?

The first-fruits unto God and the Lamb: of the same kind as the harvest which will follow, and like first-fruits, only a small proportion to the whole; a first- fruits sheaf may in its ears be numbered, the harvest is innumerable.

If it be so, can the elders and the living creatures of the fourth and fifth chapters be considered as the church? for this company (together with the raised dead, possibly alluded to in the second verse) appears as a distinct body, and sing *before* the throne, *and before* the elders, *and before* the living creatures.

May Mr. Govett's suggestion with reference to them be correct, namely, *that* the twenty-four elders are the chief officers of the heavenly King, ruling over angels and the living creatures, representatives of the animate creation of the globe; that they here appear as the attendants of the Ancient of Days, who now formally hands over the dominion of the earth to the Son of Man.

True, these twenty-four sing (Rev. v. 9, 10), *but* according to Tregelles, the words in the tenth verse should be "them," not "us;" and in verse 9, "us" is questionably genuine, according to Govett.

We note their utterance to John (Rev. vii. 14), and their shout (Rev. xi. 18), all expressive of some distinction from the church.

Their character:

Redeemed: "Purchased" by the blood of Jesus Christ.

Undefiled: this cannot signify that they had never known sin, at least in thought, but now washed, sanctified, justified; "virgins," not guilty of spiritual idolatry—surely the term may not signify the unmarried; marriage is a commanded ordinance, the Lord Jesus honoured its feast with his presence, and it was by the Spirit employed as an illustration of the Saviour's indissoluble union with his church.

Digitized by Google

Guileless: loved sincerity, hated every false way, lived the truth, allowed of no fraud, nor deceit for the accomplishment of their ends.

Complete: "Without fault;" when on earth, by grace and through faith they were so virtually. The Lord had borne their curse and transferred to them his righteousness; they were complete in him, now they are actually without stain; the old nature is dropped and the new is in full power.

They have the highest honour: "They follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth;" Jesus Christ has given unto them eternal life, constituted them his bride, empowered them with his authority, they are joint-heirs with Christ; and with him take the kingdom, and reign over the earth.

II. *The Song—what?*

Not that recorded in the following chapter (fifteenth); *that is,* the song of those "that had gotten the victory over the Beast, and over his image, and over his mark and number of his name" (Rev. xv. 2); and who had been subjected to the sad trials connected with the first six seals, and are as the harvest saved before the pouring forth of the last vials of divine wrath.

Neither is it the song of the elders and the living creatures of Rev. v; true, they sang a new song, and they sang in substance the song of the redeemed 144,000, and they sang concerning their redemption, and recognised the fact that God had made these redeemed ones kings and priests, and that they should reign upon the earth.

But the song itself we probably have in Rev. i. 5, 6—"Unto him that loveth us, and hath washed us from our sins, in his own blood, and hath made us a kingdom of priests unto his God and Father; to him be glory and dominion unto the age of ages. Amen." (*Tregelles.*)

Exquisitely beautiful are the words, pregnant with everlasting felicity; and how full and rich must the melody have been as it fell upon the apostle's ears, "as the voice of many waters," "as the voice of a great thunder," yet, as "the voice of harpers harping with their harps." Perhaps no earthly musical sounds will surpass the vibrations of two or three harps when skilfully played—what music then will equal these heavenly strains?

"*They sang*:" their joy was so full, so great, that it burst all bonds, leaped every barrier to the outward expression of their gladness; they were "without fault" full of healthful buoyancy—physically, mentally, and spiritually—the sons of God, the possessors of felicity and dignity co-equal with that of the Prince of the kings of the earth, and co-extensive as the age of ages.

"*They sang before the throne,*" *etc.*

There the praises of Jehovah had been long sung, "Holy, holy, holy," etc.

There, too, the sons of God shouted for joy, when this world awoke into being.

There, too, "Glory to God in the Highest," when to us a son was given.

But that was angel-worship; *this* the melody of ransomed sinners, the full and deep-toned choir of men redeemed, the shout of victory from a long line of kings, a common chorus heightened by a common triumph.

No man could learn it beside themselves; to none others suitable.

Joyful as that from the victors upon the sea of glass mingled with

Digitized by Google

fire (Rev. xv. 2, 3); necessarily was *this more so;* it is the song of recipients of higher honour, *those* victors passed through the tribulation; *these,* the 144,000, are counted worthy to escape, *for those victors* the days were shortened, they were spared the last vials; *these escape* "*all* those things which are coming upon the earth."

May it be our happy privilege to join that song.

III. *The season—when?*

Evidently before the reign of Antichrist commences; for, from Rev. xii. 1, 2, the Man-child is caught up from the earth before Satan is cast down to the earth, and this takes place before the last wilful king manifests his power. *Again, we believe that* the angel (verse 6), with the everlasting gospel to preach to every nation, synchronizes with the opening of the first seal, *a period when multitudes* who now despise prophetic truth, and give no heed to the "light shining in a dark place," as the apostle terms it (2 Pet, i. 19), *shall,* by the removal of the watching waiting ones, be roused to consideration and become truly converted! *and before this* these 144,000 are with the Lord.

It may be but *a very little while* before those last days.

It may be a few years before.

It may be at any hour now; indeed it might have been at any time past after the revelation made, and therefore may be at any hour, since we can find no prophecy which must *necessarily* be accomplished before that great event.

The day of the Lord's wrath cannot come before; those who love his appearing will be safely housed. (2 Thess. ii. 1, 2, etc.)

IV. *The special preparation;* "no man could learn that song," etc.

The language seems to mean, that none others upon the earth *were prepared* to join them, *or capable* of uniting with them.

But it clearly implies that they shall have *honour peculiar to themselves.*

Perhaps even over those who had fallen asleep in Christ—*why not, if the Lord has willed it? Certain reasons* may suggest themselves; as a rule, the sleeping ones were expecting death, in very many cases there would be a strong purifying process going on for days, weeks, months perhaps; and this absolutely necessary to wean from earth. *But these must live in that* state, entirely weaned from the earth, all things accounted nothing, every day living and acting as though that day were to be the last; *they have added* to their faith virtue, knowledge, etc. (2 Pet. i. 6); *daily striving* to serve the Lord, *whilst* thankfully using his gifts, *holding* them with a light hand; *willing* to depart, would count it infinite gain, patiently waiting, but also earnestly watching.

What of ourselves? Supposing that in a very short period our Lord should come—*are we ready?*

Exeter. E. H. TUCKETT.

Digitized by Google

Literature.

The Apocalypse; or, Revelation of St. John the Divine; explained, illustrated, and practically considered; with historical and other notes: showing the approaching fall of Papal Rome, the Restoration of the Jews, and Second Advent of Christ. By the Rev. W. Stone, A.M., Vicar of St. Paul's, Broke Road, Dalston. London: W. Macintosh.

Mr. Stone has been at pains to collect a number of historical facts, but what have *historical* facts to do with a book which—excepting the first three chapters—is altogether in the future? He says the book of Revelation "will be seen to comprise a kind of hieroglyphic history under picture, symbol, and allegory, of the church of Christ in the world." Great men have held this theory, but we must deny its soundness. Of the piety and Christian feeling of Mr. Stone's practical remarks, we speak gratefully; but an explanation of the Apocalypse from history, or while the church is on the earth, is impossible. It is clearly a prophecy of the woes that precede the restitution of all things.

The Expressive Reading of the Sacred Scriptures; as promoted by emphasised translation, according to the logical idiom of the inspired originals. By Joseph B. Rotherham. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, Paternoster Row.

This sixpenny pamphlet contains seven sections, respectively entitled: Importance of reading the Bible well; Expository value of emphasis; Authoritative indication of emphasis; Law of emphasis explained; Proof of an emphatic idiom; Emphasised translation needed; Plan of a proposed emphasised translation. From this it will be seen that Mr. Rotherham condenses much valuable matter in small compass. The pamphlet is of great merit; and as we accept it as an explanation of the principles that guide him in the sacred work in which he is engaged—"The Emphasised Critical New Testament for English Readers"—we can but feel that this work, when published, will be a great boon to thousands who are unable to read the New Testament in its original language. Mr. Rotherham has the happy art of conveying to the reader in language of wonderful clearness, the thoughts formed in his own mind. We hope that many persons will signify their intention to Messrs. Bagster & Sons, of purchasing Rotherham's Emphasised New Testament.

The Advent Christian Quarterly. Edited by William L. Himes. Buchanan, Michigan. Western Advent Christian Publishing Association, 1869.

This is the first number of a quarterly journal devoted to the great questions connected with the second coming of the Lord, the nature and destiny of man, and related topics. We give this fresh witness to the truth a brotherly and right hearty welcome, and wish it great prosperity. The articles are well selected, combining variety with vigour, and giving promise of a very useful serial, which will add another to the existing proofs that our American Advent brethren are Christian men deeply in earnest, and working with a zeal which English Millenarians would do well to copy.

Life and Immortality in Christ only. Birmingham: Cornish Brothers.

This is the substance of six lectures by Mr. E. W. P. Taunton, of Birmingham. We are highly gratified with this seasonable pamphlet. The argument is well sustained and convincing, and the style is remarkably clear. Mr. Taunton takes the Bible for his guide, and the result is a contribution to the cause of truth, for which we thank our brother very sincerely.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

NOVEMBER 1, 1869.

THE JUDGMENT OF THE NATIONS.

IMPORTANT STATEMENT BY THE REV. DR. LEASK, AT MABERLY CHAPEL, ON SUNDAY EVENING LAST.*

[*By our Special Reporter.*]

THIS evening, my friends, it is my intention to make a statement, preach a sermon, and ask a question.

THE STATEMENT.

There is one man in the world of whom I never like to speak, and that is myself, but in this case a brief personal statement is desirable with regard to what I may call my mental history, *i.e.*, my mental history respecting the destiny of the lost. I have very vivid sights of things; it is an intellectual characteristic, not acquired, and it is the fact that I look at some matters in an intense light. Many years ago, in the exercise of this faculty, I was distressed exceedingly at the thought—the appalling thought—that the overwhelming majority of human beings were to derive no benefit from the death of the Son of God. I tried to realise, according to the teachings of ordinary theology, the dogma that countless millions of human beings were to be kept in a life of torture as long as God himself lived. I looked at his character as a God of love, who so loved man as to give his only-begotten Son to a life of sorrow, and a death of ignominy and

* This discourse is taken from the *Hackney and Kingsland Gazette.* Not a word of it was written beforehand, and we were not aware of the presence of the Reporter until after the service. This remark is made simply by way of apology for its appearance in this form. The Reporter has, however, done his work well; and if the argument from Scripture shows that we have taken the stronghold of those who press Matthew twenty-fifth into the service of everlasting *torment*, the literary defects of extemporaneous speech, as compared with a carefully written paper, may readily be forgiven.—*Editor.*

Digitized by Google

agony; I looked at his gracious appeals to us, his tenderness, his loving care for the widow, the orphan, the stranger, and the outcast, and I could not reconcile the manifest inconsistency. "It is no business of yours to reconcile it," I have been told. I beg pardon, all that is revealed belongs to me. I never pry into the unrevealed. As time went on, I found that this common doctrine of theology had made a countless number of infidels; men told us in plain language, "We cannot believe in a God that will everlastingly damn his creatures." I found that persons had been driven to madness by the contemplation of this awful theory. I heard men blaspheme the God I love on account of this doctrine, but I, like others, thought and spoke of the immortal soul and the never-dying soul. Again the subject came before, and I re-examined Scripture and found, to my utter amazement, that no such word appears in the book as "the immortal soul of man," or, "never-dying soul." Here a flood of light burst upon me. If this be so; if man, as man, is simply a natural being, a mortal being, the doctrine of an immortal life in hell cannot possibly be true. I have always preached the doctrine of life *only in Christ*, but in the usual theological light, the spiritual life, instead of the natural life we derive from Adam. In investigating this, I felt compelled to take this position—we must take God's word *literally*, except where parable or metaphor is found; everything that looks like a doctrinal statement must be accepted as the plain utterance of the Holy Ghost. I found this key invaluable. I saw that there are more resurrections than one—*the resurrection of the lost, and the resurrection of the righteous, do not take place simultaneously.* I saw, too, what I have been teaching for many years past, that the kingdom and the church are two distinct things—that the coming of the Lord will supersede the present dispensation, and that the present dispensation is the era of the church. At the same time, I narrowly studied the meaning of words. Philology is important in theology. I looked at the original meaning of the words, in the language in which the Bible was given, and though "everlasting" frequently expresses far more than its Greek original, I accept it literally in relation to the doom of the wicked, because irrevocable destruction of being *is* "everlasting punishment." Now I look around me, and find numbers in Germany, multitudes in America, and not a few in England, who have recoiled from the doctrine, that the devil is to triumph and have the majority—that groaning misery and blasphemy are to exist for ever; recoiling from that, they have adopted the theory of *restoration*. Hundreds, thousands of Protestants, who protest against the Roman Catholic purgatory, have invented a Protestant purgatory, which is infinitely worse. I searched again, and came to the conclusion that *restoration* is unknown to Scripture. I cannot bear the thought that the fires of hell are to be more efficacious than the blood of Jesus. I have

Digitized by Google

taught the destruction of the wicked for some time past, in the magazine which I have the honour to conduct, and I am glad to-night to come before you and be able to state—though I feel a deep sense of responsibility—that hundreds and thousands are meditating upon this great question. I am now about to place before you no theory of my own, no mere reasoning, but an exposition of Scripture, leaving it to you to judge whether or not it is according to truth. I shall conclude by asking a question, the answer to which is of importance to you as a congregation, and to me as your pastor.

THE SERMON.

"Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."—Matthew xxv. 41, 46.

This is the stronghold of those who believe that the everlasting punishment of the wicked is life in hell, but I will prove to you that this passage says absolutely nothing about the dead, and if I can show that this—one of the strongest passages for the theory in question—does not teach it, and that the unsaved dead of past and future generations are not on the scene at all, I shall have put in your hands a key with which to open the locks of this theological dispute. What are the facts? There is no mention of *resurrection* in the context; the people living on the earth when Jesus Christ shall set his feet on Mount Olivet—the sheep and goats spoken of in this passage—men in fleshly bodies are referred to, and none else. Our Lord *begins* his ministry with his wonderful sermon on the mount; what the name of that mount was I do not know, but the character of the sermon we all know; it is didactic, moral, spiritual, and deeply suggestive; our Lord *closes* his public ministry with a sermon on a mount, the Mount of Olives. We find that sermon in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of St. Matthew. Two days after he had uttered these words, he was betrayed and handed over to his enemies. About the last words of such a sermon there must be something exceedingly important. We have described to us the disciples coming to him in great distress, after he had told them that he was about to leave them, and saying, What a beautiful temple, what a glorious building, what stones we see here, what cost, what splendid architecture! He had just bidden farewell to Jerusalem, in the words, "Ye shall see me no more, until ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The entire discourse refers to his return, and the allusions and references are so purely Jewish, that the disciples could not fail to understand him. This fact will throw great light upon the subject. The parable of the virgins begins thus: "*Then* shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins;" the other parable is, "The kingdom of heaven is like a man travelling into a far country," who when he returns rewards his servants according to their fidelity. Now, could Christ's Jewish hearers

Digitized by Google

understand him in these sayings? Undoubtedly the moral import of these teachings is, "I am to be taken from you, and crucified, but I will do *all* the prophets have said, notwithstanding." Prophets have spoken about the Lord being married to his Jewish people—it shall be so; prophets have spoken about the Lord being proprietor of the world, and requiring fidelity in his stewards—I will come and demand an account; prophets have spoken about the "goats," and repeatedly described the enemies of Israel under this name, and the prophets have spoken about the time of tribulation, when the Lord will come and deliver the suffering remnant of Israel. He meant to say, "Do not be terrified, I will prove myself the promised Messiah." That was the impression produced on their minds.

I. Who are the *persons judged?* You will find them described in Joel iii. 2. "I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land." The septuagint uses the very words of Matthew, *pánta tà êthne*, "all nations," all the heathen. Now look at Isaiah x. 20, 21: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall no more again stay upon him that smote them, but shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth. The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God." Clearly our Lord is describing the time when the controversy of Sion shall be settled, and if you just look at what he says in the chapter we have read, you will see this. Inasmuch as ye did it, or did it not, to one of these my brethren, who are described as sick, as imprisoned, as hungred, as athirst, as naked, and as deeply afflicted, ye have done it, or not done it, unto me. He is speaking of his Jewish brethren, the remnant of Israel that have turned to the Lord, and that have dared to refuse to worship the Antichrist. The enemies of God on the one hand, and the persecuted Jews on the other, are obviously referred to in the seventy-ninth and hundred and second Psalms. "Wherefore should the heathen say, Where is their God? let him be known among the heathen in our sight by the revenging of the blood of thy servants which is shed. Let the sighing of the prisoner come before thee; according to the greatness of thy power preserve thou those that are appointed to die." (Ps. lxxix. 10, 11.) "For he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary; from heaven did the Lord behold the earth; to hear the groaning of the prisoner; to loose those that are appointed to death; to declare the name of the Lord in Zion, and his praise in Jerusalem; when the people are gathered together, and the kingdoms, to serve the Lord." (Ps. cii. 19—22.)

Now then we have this: we have the triumph of Antichrist, and the

Digitized by Google

picture of the small, faithful remnant who refuse to worship him and receive his mark on their foreheads; we see many in dungeons, "appointed to die." The mandate has gone forth from the cruel king, that no one shall relieve them under penalty of death; but Christ says to the righteous, "You have relieved those who were in prison, your suffering, tortured brethren, and now I have heard the sighing of the prisoner, and have come to deliver him." This is the time described in Rev. vi. 16, 17, when the panic-stricken foes of the Lord shall call to the mountains and rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: For the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"

Christ has come to open the prison-houses of Judea, and other parts of the world over which the blaspheming Antichrist has had power, and he deals with nations, the representatives of the world who shall be present at that time; he calls them before him, and he deals with them as the Shepherd-King of Israel, who has come to his throne. He sets the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left.

II. Now we come to the *sentence* contained in the text. The language is distinctly Jewish, and refers to matters which the Lord's hearers would easily understand. Christ does not speak about the church to these Jews, because at that time it did not exist, and they would not have understood him. Look at Isaiah lxvi. 15, 16: "For, behold, the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh: and the slain of the Lord shall be many." Passing over the next few verses, read the twenty-fourth. "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." Go a little further, down to Malachi, and we see the effect of fire upon these impious men. "For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts. (Malachi iv. 1, 3.) There is no mention of "resurrection." It is manifestly the judgment of the living Come, then, to the man who connects the two Testaments, John the Baptist, and hear what he has to say about the Lord Jesus as the King of Israel. "He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." (Matthew iii. 12.)

Anyone will see, without knowing Greek, that chaff having had fire

Digitized by Google

set to it, will speedily be reduced to ashes. If the fire be not quenched, the work of destruction will be complete. It is a remarkable fact that hell is never mentioned in the letters written by the apostles to the churches. Peter and James wrote, as you are aware, to the twelve tribes and the scattered ones of Israel: James uses the word "hell" once when speaking of the tongue of the wicked—"It is set on fire of hell"—that is purely a metaphor. Peter speaks about the rebellious angels being cast down into hell, but that is a wrong translation of the word "tartarus," which means a prison-house, not necessarily of punishment, but a place of detention, where these angels, whoever they were, are "reserved unto judgment." We should like very much if we could find from one of Christ's apostles, how he understood the everlasting punishment mentioned by the king of Israel in our text. Well, it so happens that we can. Turn to 2 Thessalonians i. 9, and you will get an inspired explanation of "everlasting punishment." "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction"—literally whose punishment shall be eternal destruction—"from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Here criticism of the meaning of words is exceedingly important. If those of you who can do so will look at your Greek Lexicon, it will be seen that the word "destruction" is the strongest, except the word "perish," which has substantially the same meaning—for an utter and eternal cessation of being; "everlasting punishment," as explained by Paul, is "everlasting destruction."

The meaning of the expression throughout the Scriptures is Destruction—the very words of our text prove this: "These shall go into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal," or "life everlasting." What is the contrast, what is the opposite of life?—Death! Throughout the Scriptures this is the fact of the case. In that gospel text, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but have everlasting life," the same meaning is clear. The Scripture statement is "the wicked shall not be," that is, being shall cease, the organised being shall come to an end. It is the same thing as annihilation, practically, but it is not that, for I maintain that there is nothing to annihilate; no mortal life could possibly be continued without a miracle. If you notice throughout the Scriptures, God speaks of us as descended from a man, having natural animal life only, and he speaks of the salvation he sends to us that we may have life, and not come into condemnation as a "gift;" the punishment being by fire, as it was of the old world by the deluge of water.

III. Let me ask your attention to the *place of execution*, and you will see that as far as I have gone everything is perfectly harmonious. "When the Lord comes and sits upon his glorious throne, he will gather all nations before him." If you take the great men and the chief captains who shall

Digitized by Google

be there by order of the Antichrist, you have the representatives of the heathens. The time for that judgment may be very brief, but if you like to prolong the thought, you may well imagine that the nations are shortening the period that will elapse, that telegraphs and railroads are hastening the time, when the true king of humanity shall be on his throne, and put down all evil. You will not understand this subject, unless you believe in Jesus Christ as king sitting upon his throne of glory; on his left (to the south of Jerusalem) stretches a long valley, known among the Jews, as the valley of Jehosophat, or, the valley of the Son of Hinnom. The god of the Ammonites (named Molech), was worshipped in that part of the valley of Jehosophat, known as the valley of the Son of Hinnom. Now, God had strictly forbidden the Israelites to pass their children through the fire to Molech, but they did it frequently, notwithstanding. Solomon had built a temple to Molech, to please his heathen wives. Manasseh made his children to pass through the fire, not necessarily to kill them, for I find his son reigning afterwards, from which I discover that it was not death always but a horrible and burning ceremony. In a part of the valley of the Son of Hinnom the prophet locates Tophet, which comes from Toph, meaning a drum, a drum being beaten to prevent the screams of the children from being heard, whilst they were being branded. Amon, Manasseh's son, was equally wicked, but his grandson Josiah, worshipped God. Search the book of Kings, and you will find all this, for I go by my brief. Josiah defiled the valley of Tophet, to prevent the horrid rites of Molech. You are aware that those who maintain the doctrine of eternal torments have said that the "gnawing worm" means "an accusing conscience," and that "everlasting fire" means "perpetual misery"; thus they have departed from the literal word of God; they believe in their own inference—in their own emblem. I do not believe anything of the kind. I take the "worm" and the "fire" *literally*. You see at once that the abominable stuff thrown in the valley would breed vermin, and it did: to prevent the city being affected by disease caused by the exhalation of noxious vapours, it was commanded that fires should be lit to consume the refuse. There we have the Gehennah, or valley of Hinnom of Scriptures. When Christ said: "If thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched," the people understood him, for they knew that these fires were kept perpetually burning. When the Lord comes, his adversaries will be consumed, and, as if to put the everlasting brand of infamy on the wickedness of men who sacrificed to the horrible god Molech, the spot on which they did so is selected as the place of execution, where the enemies of the great king, who are found in open rebellion against him at his coming,

Digitized by Google

will be destroyed by fire. The scene of condemnation is close by the future capital of the whole world. After the place had thus become a receptacle for the filth of the city, the fire was not quenched, but continued burning as long as there was anything to burn. Let us now look at Mark ix. 43, which I have just read to you. This is a very erroneous translation, it should be "into the fire that *is not* quenched" and not "into the fire that *never shall be* quenched." Fires were kept perpetually burning: long since have these fires ceased, but the valley of the Son of Hinnom is destined yet to have the greatest fire it ever saw, or was ever witnessed, for then shall the living rebels at the time of the Lord's advent be sentenced to a fire that shall burn them up, to "everlasting," eternal destruction. The place of execution is this valley of the Son of Hinnom. I give you this rapid sketch in exposition of this famous passage to show *that it relates to the living wicked* at the time of the Lord's advent, and not to men raised from the dead.

Now what about the dead? There are three acts of judgment: first the church, regarding which it is written, "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ." I have explained in former sermons, that the Lord will gather his people together, not to judge them for life or death, but to judge them for their fidelity, the use of their stewardship, and to appoint them their places in the kingdom of glory. Here is the second act of judgment; and the third will be for the dead, small and great at the end of the millennium, before the great white throne, when every one whose name is not written in the book of life will be cast into the lake of fire. After that we read, "Behold, I make all things new, and there shall be no more death, neither pain nor sorrow."

Taking into account the fact that God has set before us life and death, that he has determined to head up all things in Christ, that he has resolved on a period when every creature in heaven and earth shall praise him; taking into account the wonderful work of God's beloved Son; taking into account that eternal death is always pronounced against those who reject Jesus Christ; you must think of God who is rich in wisdom and in grace, who is determined to purify his world, to glorify his Son Jesus, and to give him unlimited authority over all creatures. Let me assure you that I never saw the doctrine of the new birth in such a vivid light as that in which I see it now—I mean the life in Christ of men who would otherwise die—I never felt so much liberty in denouncing God's anger against those rebels who continue in sin, and in pointing out to them that rejecting Christ they have no hope, but must perish everlastingly; that all the splendours and glories of the coming ages of ever developing glory, will be lost to them, and they will be branded with everlasting disgrace. I never felt more strongly the necessity of the doctrine of Christ's divinity. If we are to live for

Digitized by Google

ever, we must have a life that is supernatural, and that is only to be obtained from him who only hath immortality. Let me add, that I never before saw more vividly the necessity of the Holy Spirit as the "quickener of the dead" to make them new creatures in Christ, and I never loved God so much as I do now, when I see somewhat the beautiful completeness of his word. The harmony between the sayings of the prophets in the Old Testament, and the passages in the New Testament, clearly shows us that they are but two volumes of the one book. One more word: we can see that in the God who is Life, the God who is Love, we can have the most absolute confidence; whilst we urge upon men—if they would escape the horrors of the second death and enjoy immortality—the absolute necessity of union with the second Adam, the Lord Jesus Christ.

THE QUESTION.

And now for my question: Men and brethren, will you rally around me, and stand by me, whilst holding up the doctrine of life only in the Son of God, or will you not? That is the question which I now put before you, and I ask for your decision? I know full well the prejudices in favour of doctrines we have received in childhood: I received them in the most rigid school; but now I am committed to this glorious truth, that there is eternal life only in Christ. I have sacrificed much—at least, it was much to me, and thereby I have at least proved my sincerity—to maintain this doctrine in the pulpit and through the press, and I am ready to sacrifice all, for what I believe to be divinely true. If you stand by me, and cheer me in this trial, the day may come when you will thank God for it, but if you think right to desert me, as some have done, and others threaten to do, do it, and may God go with you! But my position is taken. Here, as elsewhere, I have argued this with my voice and with my pen, and I emphatically state to you my firm determination that I shall continne to declare what I have this night maintained, respecting the living and the dead, the past and the future, and all that we owe to our Saviour Jesus Christ. If you stand by me, and encourage me, it is well; but if you think it right to do otherwise, perhaps it will be well, too. My course is taken, and that course I will follow, by the help of my glorious Master, who only hath immortality, and whom to know is life eternal. Amen.

Digitized by Google

THE RESURRECTION BODY.

I DESIRE, if not too late, to express my appreciation of Mr. G. R. Wynne's paper, entitled, "The Blessed Hope," which appeared in the "*Rainbow*" for May, and to make some brief comments thereon. It is evident from the earnest and practical spirit which pervades its pages, that that "blessed hope" has its due and designed effect upon the writer's heart and mind, and that, having that hope he purifieth himself, even as the glorious and exalted object of his hope is pure. The opposite of this is that intellectualism which, while it reasons out the truth of the coming of the Lord, and ably, though sometimes harshly upholds and defends it, yet leaves the heart unenkindled by those emotions, and the life without that "most purifying effect," which its possession and contemplation, when properly held and realised, stamp the walk of God's children. One who understood this has said, "Ignorance itself—at least ignorance of everything in truth but that which is most elementary—where the heart is constrained in its impulses by the love of Christ, one is almost tempted to prefer to knowledge in its brightest exhibitions and its widest range, where the affections are left to wither amidst cold abstractions." In regard to the study of all those themes of truth which require close application of mind, and careful elaboration and analysis, it is of vital importance as touching our profit and comfort therein, that we should guard against declension into mere abstract reasoning, too much apart from him who is the centre and fulness of all revelation, and should closely cherish and habitually dwell upon those living truths which centre in and radiate from the person of the living Saviour; and which, if I may be allowed the expression, should constitute the conservative principles in our minds, when pursuing those subjects of truth which require studious and systematised thought.

I have full fellowship with Mr. Wynne in most of his teaching as set out in the "blessed hope," and I gladly and cordially acknowledge its general excellence; but there is one thought therein expressed to which I desire to call attention and briefly review. I apprehend from some of his remarks, that he entertains the thought that the atoms composing these bodies we now inhabit, will be raised and immortalised at the coming of the Lord. It is from the two following statements I gather the supposition. He says, "We know that our Redeemer liveth, but, oh! the raptures of the thought that '*in our flesh we shall see God.*'" And, "But clear as the noonday sun is the promise, on which we build our hope—the glory of the resurrection of the just, not the continuance of the spirit's consciousness when the body is in decay, but *the re-habilitating of the disembodied spirit*

Digitized by Google

in garments which are new and yet old, the body renewed, spiritualised perfected, but yet a body still, even as Christ's resurrection body, which still bore the mark of the spear and the print of the nails, and which could still be recognised by those who knew him on the earth."

The thought embodied in and inculcated by these statements seems to be, that these physical organisms through which we—that is to say, our souls, which are essentially ourselves—are now manifest, are to be again brought forth from the dust of the earth, if so be we depart before Christ shall come, and are, after being "renewed, spiritualised, perfected," to be those through which we are again to become manifest when with and like our risen Lord.

Now this, if I mistake not, involves a physical impossibility, and is precisely the error upon which was based the denial by the Corinthian Christians of the doctrine of the resurrection, whose false reasonings were met by Paul's masterly defence. In his argumentation, the apostle first asserts and demonstrates the truth that there is a resurrection from among the dead, logically proceeding upon the fact of Christ's resurrection, and upon the principle that if the Head be raised, then the body must rise. He then notices the erroneous assumption upon which the Corinthians had built their argument by which they deduced the impossibility of the resurrection of the dead, thus, "But some will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" It will be perceived that in the question is involved an assertion of the physical impossibility of the resurrection. Their whole difficulty doubtless grew out of their failure to apprehend the important truth that the immaterial soul is essentially the man, and this material body, though wonderful in its organic structure and adaptability to the wants of the soul, is, in itself, a thing of comparative insignificance, doomed to return to its native dust. They were well acquainted with the transformations of matter, and knew that the atoms which once composed a man's body, might be and were possessed by plants and animals, and in turn again by other men. They supposed that the doctrine of the resurrection was spoken concerning, or at all events as including, the body; that the fact of resurrection necessitated the standing forth again in their original form of those same atoms of which the man was possessed at the time of his death; and therefore, not understanding that the truth concerning it was the standing forth again of the persons—that is, the souls—embodied, they thought they had erected by their philosophic reasoning, an unsurmountable barrier to this glorious doctrine; and so they said, "it is impossible, 'there is no resurrection of the dead.'" And indeed if their hypothesis were true, then would their objection be unanswerable. But in these matters, as the apostle tells them to their shame, they had not the knowledge of God. Their postulate was untenable;

Digitized by Google

they were corrupted by evil communications; and the well merited reproof for such carnal questionings, and their failure to apply their knowledge of even the first principles of vegetation, is found in the words, "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die; and that which thou sowest, *thou sowest not that body which shall be,* but naked grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain: *but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.*" And after using other illustrations and forms of argument, the apostle adds, "there is a natural—or psychical—body, and there is a spiritual body." Thus he clearly teaches that the bodies we now possess are natural or psychical, the product of the soul, and that the bodies we shall have in resurrection will be spiritual, the product of the spirit, in accordance with those words of the Lord to Nicodemus on the subject of regeneration, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." These expressions, "sown in corruption," &c., do not refer to the placing of the body in the ground after death, but to the psychical and physical condition of the natural being, as derived through generation from the first Adam:—"sown a psychical body, raised a spiritual body." The truth of this statement will be perceived by reference to the following verse, the forty-fifth. Paul has corrected the fleshly conceits of these Corinthians, and concludes by the explicit declaration, "*flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;* neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."

And now, having set forth the Scripture truth concerning resurrection, I desire to examine briefly into the true intent of the words of Job, quoted by Mr. Wynne. They are, with their connection, as they stand in our English bibles, as follows: "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." Though this Scripture is so commonly appropriated by Christians, as referring to that which is to be the consummation of their salvation, still, aside from the fact that its popular exposition directly contradicts the great truth contended for by Paul as mentioned above, it can be clearly shown to refer only to those events which transpired during Job's affliction, and immediately thereafter. It is very apparent that our translators found some difficulty with the passage, from the marginal readings they give. In order to arrive at a correct understanding of this Scripture, it is essential that the following particulars should be understood and carefully weighed. The Hebrew noun here translated "Redeemer," means not only Redeemer, but kinsman, vindicator, deliverer. In regard to Job's words respecting the destroying or consuming of his body—or taking them literally, as a recently published translation

Digitized by Google

of the book of Job has it, "after this my skin is destroyed"—he before had said, "My flesh is clothed with worms and clods of dust; my skin is broken and become loathsome." It will also be noticed that the word *day* is supplied in the received version. From these facts we perceive that Job's words refer to his physical condition then, and are the expression of his confidence that God would surely appear and vindicate him, as afterwards God did when he answered out of the whirlwind, and said to Job's friends, "Ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right like my servant Job." Job's intent was to declare that he knew his Vindicator lived, and would stand upon the earth in the end of his affliction; that so great was his confidence of his final vindication, that he was assured that even though the loathsome disease that then corroded his flesh should consume it, yet he would certainly, in his flesh, see God, would behold him with his eyes, even though his reins were consumed. And if it be not yet clear that such was the force of Job's words, a reference to the last chapter of the book will disclose their literal fulfilment. He had said, "Yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and *mine eyes shall behold.*" And after the Lord had appeared to him, we hear him say, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: but *now mine eye seeth thee.*"

Elsewhere Job does indeed give expression to a hope that went beyond the decay of the body, and in the consummation of which he should triumphantly rise out of and beyond the power of death; for he said, "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. *Thou shalt call and I will answer;* thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hand." And in beautiful accord with this expression of joyous triumphant hope, are those words of the Lord Jesus, "The hour is coming *and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live.*" Job went down into the territory of death, under its power and as its *victim;* but Jesus went down into that same province as conqueror, and let out a multitude of captives. Christ called, and Job answered. A careful perusal of the words of the Lord just quoted, taken in their connection, and especially with the subsequent words, "Marvel not at this," &c., will convince that the popular understanding of them as referring to sinners dead in trespasses and in sins, is not the true one.

In the other statement of Mr. Wynne above quoted, which he also uses to establish the thought of the resurrection of these same bodies, he speaks of the body raised as "a body still, even as Christ's resurrection body," &c. I apprehend that his use of this similitude arises from an incomplete and somewhat erroneous conception concerning the condition of the Lord's body when he rose from among the dead, which was also that of his humiliation, and the intent of his appearing in that body to his disciples, and from the failure to sufficiently distinguish between that condition of his body and

Digitized by Google

his now "glorious body." The outlines of the truth on this subject are briefly these:—As was anciently predicted of him that his flesh should not see corruption, so not even the taint of decomposition passed upon it. And on the third day he rose from the dead, and, according to his declaration to Mary on the morning of that day, and his words to his sorrowing disciples on that same night in which he was betrayed, he ascended, in his humiliation body, into the presence of the Father, bearing with him, in the print of the nails and his pierced side, the evidences of his sacrificial death, and there officially presented himself before the Father for his acceptance. In this act he was the antitype of the high priest bearing into the presence chamber of Jehovah the blood of the sin-offering, the evidence that life had been taken, and so, ceremonially, atonement made. And having thus taken into court, so to speak, that which testified that he—the antytipical sin-offering—had laid down his life, and so fulfilled the Father's special commandment, and being there and then accepted, he came again in that same body to his disciples, according to his promise, "A little while and ye shall not see me, and again, a little while and ye shall see me, *because I go to the Father* . . . . . ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice; and ye shall be sorrowful, *but your sorrow shall be turned into joy.*" And he brought to them from the Father the precious fruits of his acceptance, peace and the Holy Ghost: and we are told, "*Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord.*" They were to be witnesses, not only to the fact of his incarnation and death, but of his resurrection. Therefore was it necessary that they should behold and handle him after resurrection as they did before. And the fact and truth of his still being in that body which he at the first humbled himself to assume, and of its really being him, Jesus of Nazareth, the crucified but then risen Christ, was confirmed to them all by his eating with them, and to Thomas by his beholding his hands and his side. And after having "*shewed himself to them alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days,* and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," he was received up *in* glory (ἐν δόξῃ). And because the disciples were to bear unwavering testimony to the fact of his ascension, in common with the facts of his incarnation, death and resurrection, therefore as he ascended, they beheld his *body of humiliation*—that which they could witness was *his* body—rising upwards towards heaven. Observe the explicitness of the record: "And when he had spoken these things, *while they beheld,* he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight." And the cloud having shut him from their view, he was received up *in* glory, in a state of glory, in his *glorious body,* the enshrining and outshining glory of which, exceeding the brightness of the meridian sun, and which struck Paul with blindness, could not have been stedfastly beheld

Digitized by Google

by the disciples. And when he shall come again even as he went, then shall we with all who are his, but who are now corruptible and mortal, put on incorruption and immortality, and our *new* bodies shall be fashioned like unto his glorious body.

I have thus endeavoured, in the spirit of kindness and Christian love, to speak concerning Mr. Wynne's statements, and I trust he will receive the remarks in that same spirit in which they are offered, my sole desire being our mutual profit and growth in "the knowledge of God."

Philadelphia. E. FURMAN BALDWIN.

WHAT IS MAN?

PART II.

HAVING, in our previous paper, given the answer of the *Materialist* to this very important and very personal question, and adduced a few of the weighty and conclusive arguments, which we regard as entirely subversive of his theory, we now proceed, in the second place, to the consideration of the answer of the *Immaterialist*, which exhibits the most marked contrast thereto. It must be admitted, indeed, that *Immaterialist* is not a perfectly accurate designation of the disciple of the psychological school to whose teachings we are about to direct the reader's attention; but it so happens that the only other name which suggests itself, that of "Spiritualist," though in itself perhaps preferable, has recently acquired so empirical a signification, in connection with modern necromancy, as to render it in some degree indefinite. It is not our intention, however, in the following paper to consider the psychology, interesting and not unimportant though it is, of *Spiritualism* so-called; but that theory of man's essential constitution, which has been held by the vast majority of modern theologians, though first fully and fairly carried out in the Platonic philosophy. The Immaterialist does not indeed differ from the Materialist to the extent of regarding man as altogether spiritual in like manner as the Materialist regards him, as we have seen, as altogether material. The latter theory, untenable and unscriptural as it is, can be maintained without positive absurdity, inasmuch as a soul cannot, at least under ordinary circumstances, be either seen, heard, or felt; but the material body of man is too stubborn a fact to be thus conveniently ignored, and hence the Immaterialist has perforce to content himself with depreciating its importance, and regarding its existence, when the theory is fully carried out, as a foreign and malign element in human nature.

The principal and most fundamental articles of the Immaterialist's psychological creed are three in number. (1.) *Man is a dichotomous or twofold being, consisting of an immaterial soul and a material body;* and not, as the Materialist maintains, simply and solely a material organism, of which consciousness, thought, *soul*—if you choose to use the latter term—are but the resulting phenomena. "The forces of nature meeting at a certain

Digitized by Google

point and producing a resultant, which is consciousness; the impact of one molecule of matter on another giving birth to thought as the spark flashes from the contact of flint and steel." The chemical combination of the four elementary substances—carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen producing soul, even as the chemical combination of hydrogen and oxygen produces water. (2.) Of these two diverse entities, soul and body, the former, *the soul,* IS TRULY AND ESSENTIALLY THE MAN; the body being but the house or tent, perishable and transitory, in which he lives—the instrument by means of which he maintains intercourse with the external world; the inner garment which, when worn out, will fall off in death, but only to be replaced by one infinitely better and more enduring at the resurrection—the soul, or man, in the interval, however, so far from feeling the loss of its material organism as any mutilation or deprivation of its essential nature, being on the contrary raised to a higher and more glorious state of existence, wherein it rejoices and expatiates like a bird released from the cage in which it has been long and unwillingly imprisoned. (3.) *The soul*—THE TRUE MAN—*is a pure, simple, indivisible spiritual substance,* having neither form, colour, nor locality; of which the essential nature is mind or thought, according to the celebrated aphorism of Descartes, "*Cogito, ergo sum; I think, therefore I am.*" And from this last assumption the corollary is generally drawn, that being thus absolutely simple, spiritual, and indiscerptible, the soul must, moreover, by necessity of nature, be also *immortal,* and can never cease to exist save by the fiat of the Almighty.

Now, each one of these propositions we hold to be just as erroneous, though certainly by no means so morally dangerous as those embraced in the Materialistic theory. This we shall, in the following pages, endeavour to establish; taking up the three points in order; and, lest the accuracy or fairness of our definitions of them, as above stated, should be called in question, adducing in each case some brief but sufficient evidence from the writings of Immaterialists themselves, as we have, in our previous paper, done in the case of the Materialsts.

1. As regards *the dichotomous* division of man's essential nature,* it is doubtless to the fact that Augustine—the authority and oracle not only of his own age, but of the whole Western Church down even to our own day—adopted the dichotomy of soul and body, instead of the more Scriptural trichotomy held by the earlier fathers, of body, soul, and spirit; that we owe its almost universal and long-continued acceptance, not only in the Church of Rome, but also by the Churches of the Reformation. How generally it has been accepted, even by the most eminent Protestant theologians of widely differing schools, the following brief citations (a few only from a long list that might be given) from their writings will suffice to show:—

CALVIN says, "*There can be no question that man consists of a body and a soul;* meaning by soul, an immortal though created essence, which is his noblest part. Sometimes he is called a spirit. But though the two terms, while they are used together, differ in their meaning, still, when used by itself it (spirit) is equivalent to soul."†

* The theory according to which man is divided into *two* essential elements is called *dichotomy;* that by which he is divided into *three* elements, *trichotomy.*

† "Institutes," Book I. chap. xv. § 2.

Digitized by Google

BISHOP PEARSON says, "As *man consisteth of two different parts, body and soul,* so doth Christ. He assumed a body at his conception of the blessed Virgin. . . . . And certainly if the Son of God would vouchsafe to take the frailty of our flesh, he would not omit the nobler part, our soul, without which he could not be man. . . . . Thus the whole perfect and complete nature of man was assumed by the Word."*

DR. JOHN OWEN says, "The most eminent substantial union in things natural, is that of the soul and body constituting an individual person. The soul is not human nature, nor is the body, but it is the consequent of their union. *Soul and body are the essential parts of human nature.*"†

DR. GILL writes, "*The constituent and essential parts of man* (as) created by God, *are two—body and soul;* these appear at his first formation; the one was made out of the dust, the other was breathed into him; and so at his dissolution the one returns to the dust from whence it was, and the other to God that gave it: and, indeed, death is no other than the dissolution or disunion of these two parts. The body without the spirit is dead; the one dies, the other does not."‡

DR. DICK affirms, "*The nature of man is compound, consisting of a soul as well as of a body.* These two constituent parts of human nature are joined together by an invisible and mysterious tie. Thus united, they constitute one individual, as really as if the essence of man, like that of the angels, had been perfectly simple."§

DR. J. PYE SMITH defines man, "A rational animal, or a rational spirit united to a material and organised machine, according to certain laws, or uniform principles of conjunction and mutual influence."‖

PROFESSOR KNAPP writes, "The Holy Scriptures, and even those of the Old Testament, constantly teach that *man consists of two parts, body and soul.* Nor can we suppress the conviction that there is within us a nature different from the body, and superior to it—an enlivening and quickening principle, through which we possess the power of feeling, thinking, willing, and acting."¶

DR. MARTENSEN says, "While the angels are pure spirits, and the objects of the natural world are imprisoned, as it were, in a state of unconscious corporeity, man, on the other hand, is the free, personal unity of spirit and nature, a *spiritual soul,* which is not held captive in corporeity, like natural objects, but intended to manifest itself with freedom through the instrumentality of the body, as a temple of the spirit."**

Now, we do not deny that this dichotomy is, in a popular and non-scientific sense, at once convenient and admissible; nay, that it is clearly recognised in Holy Scripture, in such passages as Eccl. xi. 7; Matt. x. 28; and James ii. 26. That is to say, so far as it is used and designed only to distinguish between the material and the immaterial in man; between that part of his nature, which is in this world the subject of

---

* "Exposition of the Creed," Art. iii.
† "The Person of Christ," chap. xviii.
‡ "Body of Divinity," vol. I. p. 386. Tegg's edition.
§ "Lectures on Theology," Vol. IV. pp. 271, 272.
‖ "Outlines of Christian Theology," p. 340.
¶ "Lectures on Christian Theology," translated by Woods, Book I. Art. 6.
** "Christian Dogmatics," § 72. (Clark.)

Digitized by Google

dissolution and that which survives the stroke of death, the distinction is sufficiently correct and intelligible. Yet when we come hereafter to analyse the constitution of man more accurately, and in accordance with the deeper teaching of Revelation, we shall find that these definitions are not only inadequate but erroneous. To enter upon this here, however, would be to anticipate much of what we shall have to say in reference to the third answer to the question, *What is man?* We must, therefore, reserve this part of our subject, simply remarking at present that the Scriptures, and especially those of the New Testament, in addition to this obvious distinction between matter and mind, the visible and the invisible, the *body* and the *soul*, distinctly indicate a further and more recondite and deeply-seated, but no less real and sharply-defined, distinction between the psychical and the spiritual, the animal and the divine, the *soul* and the *spirit*, the doctrinal, and notably the eschatological, importance of which can hardly be over-estimated.

2. Passing on, then, to the second great doctrine of the immaterial theory, namely, *that the soul is essentially* THE MAN, the body being something external to, and separate from, him; a machine designed for his temporary use, a frail and incommodious tent, in which he dwells in this life; ever associated as these figures are with the idea of imperfection, captivity, and degradation: who that is at all acquainted with our current religious literature, or with the writings of our older divines, is not perfectly familiar with it? Thus, for instance, we find that good and great man, Richard Baxter, writing in his "Dying Thoughts," in the following terms of the body and its loss by death: "It (the body) is but my shell or tabernacle, and the clothing of my soul, and not itself. It is but an instrument laid by when all its work is done, and a servant dismissed when his service is at an end. And what shall I do with a horse when I shall need to ride or travel no more? It is but the laying by the passive receiver of my soul's operations, when the soul hath no more to do with it, as I cast by my lute or other instrument when I have better employment than music to take up my time. . . . . To depart from such a body is but to be loosed from the bondage of corruption, and from a clog and prison of the soul. I say not that God put a pre-existent soul into this prison penally for former faults; I must say no more than I can prove, or than I know;* but that body, which was an apt servant to innocent man's soul, is become as a prison to him now. What alteration sin made upon the nature of the body, as whether it be more terrene and gross than else it would have been, I have no reason to assert. Of earth, or dust, it was at first, and to dust it is sentenced to return. But no doubt it hath its part in that dispositive deprivation which is the fruit of sin.

* The course of our agument in these papers will not necessitate any reference to the very ancient and wide-spread eastern doctrine of the *pre-existence* of human souls, at which Baxter here glances by no means with disfavour; a doctrine which we have seen recently revived by several able writers, as *e. g.*, by Muller, in his "Christian Doctrine of Sin," and by Dr. Edward Beecher, in "The Conflict of Ages." We may remark, however, *en passant*, that while it seems to be referred to in the question put by the disciples to Jesus, "Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" (John ix. 2), it is inferentially refuted by the apostle Paul, when he affirms, concerning Jacob and Esau, "For the children being not yet born, *neither having done good or evil*" (Rom. ix. 11); language clearly inconsistent with the idea of a pre-existent fall.

Digitized by Google

We find that the soul as sensative, is so imprisoned or shut up in flesh, that sometimes it is more than one door that must be opened before the object and the faculty can meet. In the eye, indeed, the soul seemeth to have a window to look out at, and to be almost itself visible to others; and yet there are many interposing tunicles, and a suffusion, or winking, can make the clearest sight to be as useless for the time as if it were none; and if sense be thus shut up from its object, no wonder if reason also be under difficulties from corporeal impediments; and if the soul that is yoked to such a body can go no faster than its heavy pace."

Again, taking up one of the most recent works on the human soul, we read: "What is the nature of the soul—*this mind which is* OURSELF, but which can be seen in no earthly mirror, which is without form, and which too many of us make void? Is it mortal? Does it perish with the body? Shall worms eat this invisible spirit as well as our robe of flesh, or has it a separate destiny? The answer must be sought in its structure, for only the soul itself can give us the key to unlock such depths."* And a much more able writer than Mr. Fullom, in a work of vast erudition, speaks of "*Man*" as "that miraculous engine, which includes not only all the needful machinery, but also fuel, fire, steam, and speed; and, then, in climacteric addition to these, *an engineer!*" And then, carrying out this strange figure, he asks, "Does the engineer die when the fire goes out, and the locomotive stops? When the engine madly plunges off the embankment or bridge of life, does the engineer perish in the ruin, or nimbly leap off and immortally escape?"†

All such representations as the above, however general they may be, and however orthodox they are deemed, are, we hesitate not to say, altogether unscriptural and untrue. In the first place, the Scriptures never represent or speak of the body as a mere adjunct or accident of the soul. Nor, on the other hand, do they ever regard the soul, or immaterial part, as the real man, the true *Ego*. It is curious to notice how, in this instance, opposing errors serve to neutralise each other. According to the materialist, as was shown in the former paper, the soul, or life, was only "something superadded to the man, something outside of him;" according to the immaterialist, the very same is held to be true of the body, and hence, by combining the two theories, man's nature is reduced to nonentity; it has ceased to have any real existence whatever. Both, however, are equally erroneous. It is impossible to read the record of man's original creation, as given in Genesis, without seeing that the material body is an essential element in man's constitution—that without it, though existence is possible, one of the poles is lacking on which the sphere of his perfect being turns. Man, body and soul—to use the popular dichotomous division as sufficient for our present purpose—constitutes a vital unity. "Midway between materialism and spiritualism," says Mr. Heard, "and having little in common with either, Scripture treats of man as a unit, the fractions of which never can be treated as integers." To regard man as essentially body, excluding soul as a correlative element, may be quite scientific, but it is not philosophical; to regard man as essentially soul, excluding body as a correlative element, may be very philosophical, but it is altogether unbiblical. Nowhere do

* S. W. Fullom, "The Mystery of the Soul," p. 160.
† "Alger's Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life," p. 630.

Digitized by Google

the Scriptures represent the body as the mere machine, and still less as the clog, the prison, or the enemy of the soul. Nowhere do they regard death as the emancipation, the elevation, the perfecting of man's nature. Theologians may so describe it; poets may so present it to us;* but the Scriptures ever speak of death as God's curse, and not as his blessing, and of the disembodied soul as something much less than the perfect man. We are not of those, as we trust we have sufficiently made manifest in our former remarks, who think that those who 'have fallen asleep in Christ have perished,' either for ever or for a limited period; or who regard the dead, be their moral and spiritual condition what it may, as in a state of non-existence, unconsciousness, and mere oblivion. There is such a thing as an intermediate state between death and the resurrection, the doctrinal importance of, and the consolatory considerations arising from which fact are unfortunately completely ignored or denied in our current Protestant theology. But be that state what it may to those who, like Paul, can say, "To depart and to be with Christ is far better;" or who, like the dying malefactor of old, rest in the paradise of the blessed dead; it is, nevertheless, an abnormal, an incomplete, and a transitional state. "This view of death," says Delitzsch, "as a process of enfranchisement, according to natural law, is unscriptural. But, inasmuch as the soul forsakes the body, the spirit also, which pervaded the body by means of the soul, is isolated therefrom. This isolation, if we regard death in itself as the punishment of sin, is absolutely no enfranchisement. For, to dwell in the body, to endow it with soul, and to live itself forth therein, is the innate nature and destination of the human spirit. It is therefore an unnatural condition into which the spirit is thrown back by means of death. The downfall of the soul is also the downfall of the spirit. Deprived of the body, of which it ought to be the life culminating in self-consciousness, and in which it has the proximate material and the proximate means of this life, even the spirit becomes surrounded with darkness. For death is *night*. (John ix. 4.) And such a surrounding with night is possible. For the essence of death consists in man's becoming again what he was. (Gen. iii. 19). . . . . This is the fact to which materialism points with contemptuous look of triumph. It may not be denied. Death as such does not, it is true, force man back into nothingness absolutely, but back within the limit of that nothingness which preceded his coming into being. That man continues self-conscious throughout death, and that it is possible for him to live although he dies—this is the operation of redeeming grace, which, for all who lay hold of it, changes death into life, and

* As, for instance Parnell, when he says:—

"As men who long in prisons dwell,
With lamps that glimmer round the cell,
Whene'er their suffering years are run,
Spring forth to meet the glitt'ring sun;
Such joy, though far transcending sense,
Have pious souls at parting hence:
On earth, and in the body placed,
A few and evil years they waste;
But when their chains are cast aside,
See the bright scene unfolding wide,
Clap their glad wings, and tower away,
And mingle with the blaze of day."

Digitized by Google

permits us sometimes to behold in the countenance of dying persons the bright gleam of the heaven opened to them. This redeeming grace has, even for those who reject it, placed a limit to the power of death."*

Again, the natural tendency, and in point of fact the actual result, of the theory that the soul is the real man, and death is emancipation from the thraldom of bodily existence, is to lead us to undervalue, ignore, ay, when the theory is fully carried out, to deny the great Christian doctrine—the blessed apostolic hope—of the resurrection of the body. Most striking and most instructive is it to observe how that great doctrine involves a protest equally against the error of the Materialist and the error of the Immaterialist. Materialism, as we before endeavoured to show, makes the resurrection an impossibility; Immaterialism, on the other hand, makes it an absurdity. If death be indeed the enfranchisement of the soul, its deliverance from that which prevented the development of its latent powers, and thus its elevation to a higher and fuller life, surely its re-embodiment in a material organism, however incorruptible and glorious, is to be deprecated rather than desired, as a return to a more immature and rudimentary state of existence. Shall 'a clod of earth' again 'enclose the heavenly star'? Shall the bird, exulting in its freedom, be once more confined in a cage, however gilded and adorned? Shall the beauteous butterfly lose its painted wings, and again become a crawling worm? These are questions hard to answer if the immaterialist theory is consistently to be maintained. Hence, in its extreme forms, as for instance in Swedenborgianism—the leaven of which pervades our popular theology to an extent little suspected by the uninformed—the doctrine of a bodily resurrection at the Lord's coming is utterly rejected by Immaterialism. Taking up, for example, a beautifully written and interesting little volume, entitled "Our Eternal Homes,"† which has passed through four or five editions, we read, "Man's death is (in 1 Cor. xv.) compared to the death of the grain. This comparison is exactly accurate. In the grain, it is only the husk that dies. With the man, it is only the husk—the natural body, the physical envelope—that dies. When the husk of the grain dies, the germ of new life has sprouted forth: and when the physical envelope of the man dies, the spiritual being is released from it and ascends. It is necessary that the grain should be sown that it may die, and it is necessary that it should both be sown and die that the germ of new life may ascend into the bright light and warm sunshine above its earthly resting-place. And, in like manner, man must be born that he may die, and both be born and die in order that he may rise a spiritual, immortal being. The providential purpose, in the implantation of the germ of life within the grain was, that by dying, a more munificent life might be developed; and the great design, in the birth of man was that, by dying, a nobler existence might be attained. The enlarged multiplication of the species, as the result of the death of the grain, is the symbol of the enhanced development of the powers and privileges, the gifts and the glory of human existence, to be realised in the other life.

"Sometimes this comparison of the apostle is regarded as illustrating a fancied resurrection of *the dead body;* but this view is evidently wrong. It illustrates most felicitously the resurrection of the living man from the

* "System of Biblical Psychology, pp. 471, 472. (Clark.)
† London: F. Pitman.

Digitized by Google

dead body; but to attempt to interpret it otherwise, renders the comparison singularly inapt. The germination of a seed is not the resuscitation of the dead husk, the covering of the germ; and the resurrection of *the man* is not any resuscitation of the body. The germination of the grain is the bursting up of its inner living principle into a more beautiful and a new form of existence; and the resurrection of the man is the rising up of his living principle, his spirit, into a new and grander existence. Consequently, the apostle has been really treating of the resurrection of the man from the dead body, not of the resuscitation of the dead body itself."*

And yet this doctrine of a bodily resurrection holds a position second to none in apostolic teaching. There is not a doctrine more continually or more distinctly enunciated in the Scriptures of the New Testament. The finger of inspiration ever points to the resurrection as the star of hope that shines resplendent in the night of death. All the Christian's aspirations, hopes, and promise-born anticipations respecting the life of glory spring out of it, like the almond buds from Aaron's rod of old. Do we trust in the living God? It is as he "which raiseth the dead." (2 Cor. i. 9.) Do we look for the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven? It is as that mighty Saviour, "who shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed unto the body of his glory." (Phil. iii. 21.) Did Paul forget the things which were behind, and stretch forth unto those which were before, ever pressing towards the mark? It was, "If by by any meaus he might attain unto the resurrection out of the dead." (Phil. iii. 11.) Are there any whom the words of the Holy Spirit have pronounced emphatically "blessed" as well as "holy"? It is "he that hath part in the first resurrection." (Rev. xx. 6.) And if any shall vainly attempt to say that all this refers not to the resurrection of the body, but to some fancied resurrection of the man at death, we close their lips with the words of the great apostle, "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; *afterward they that are Christ's* AT HIS COMING." (1 Cor. xv. 23). "The Christian doctrine of a future life,"

* Pp. 104—106. Precisely similar to this is the teaching of "Spiritualism." Andrew Jackson Davis, the hierophant of modern demonism, writes thus: "The butterfly escapes its gross and rudimental body, and wings its way to the sunny bower, and is sensible of its new existence. The drop of water that reposes on the earth is rendered invisible by the absorbing invitations of the sun, and ascends to associate with, and repose in, the bosom of the atmosphere. The day, that is known by its warmth and illumination, dispenses its blessings to the forms of earth, and sinks into repose in the bosom of the night. Night is, then, an index of the new day, which is first cradled in the horizon, and afterwards perfected in its noontide light, beauty, and animation. The flower, being unfolded from the interior by virtue of its own essence and the sun, is variegated in every possible manner, and thus becomes a representative of light and beauty; but having attained its perfection, it soon begins to change its form, its colour, and its beauty of external being. Its fragrance goes forth and pervades all congenial and suitable forms, and its beauty is indelibly impressed upon the memory of the beholder and admirer when the flower itself is no more. The foliage, tinted with the breath of winter, no longer retains its outward beauty; but this is an index of new life and animation, which is perfectly exemplified in the return of foliage in the youthful season. As it is with these, so it is with the spirit. The body dies on the outer, or rather changes its mode of existence, while the spirit ascends to a higher habitation, suited to its nature and requirements. *Death* is but a *door* which opens into new and more perfect existence. It is a triumphal arch, through which man's immortal spirit passes at the moment of leaving the outer world, to depart for a higher, a sublimer, and a more magnificent country."—*The Philosophy of Death.*

Digitized by Google

as Mr. Perowne has truly said, "regards the whole of man's compound nature. It introduces no dissonance, it does not honour one part of our being to the neglect or degradation of the other. The life of which it speaks is a life of the body as well as of the spirit, a life the form and pledge of which are given in the resurrection of Christ, a life which is actually communicated to us by a true and vital union with him, 'Because I live (yea, and in the manner I live), ye shall live also.' "*

3. We must, however, hasten to a conclusion; and fortunately the consideration of the third article of the Immaterialist creed, *the purely spiritual and indivisible nature of the soul*, which, though not held by those who incline to the Swedenborgian theory, forms an integrant part of the doctrine of Immaterialism in its more orthodox phases. To present this dogma, in all its metaphysical amplitude, would be to transcribe sundry ponderous treatises, in which it is paraded with all the pomp of rhetoric, and spun out into the most fantastic metaphysical cobwebs. We shall content ourselves, therefore, having regard to our rapidly diminishing space, with the clear and succinct statement of it given by the great Bishop Butler, in his famous "Analogy": "All presumption of death's being the destruction of living beings, must go upon supposition that they are compounded; and so, discerptible. But since consciousness is a single and indivisible power, it should seem that the subject in which it resides must be so too. For were the motion of any particle of matter absolutely one and indivisible, so as that it should imply a contradiction to suppose part of this motion to exist, and part not to exist—*i.e.*, part of this matter to move, and part to be at rest—then its power of motion would be indivisible; and so also would the subject in which the motion inheres, namely, the particle of matter; for if this could be divided into two, one part might be moved, and the other at rest, which is contrary to the supposition. In like manner, it has been argued, and for anything appearing to the contrary, justly, that since the perception or consciousness which we have of our own existence, is indivisible, so as that it is a contradiction to suppose one part of it should be here and the other there; the perceptive power, or the power of consciousness, is indivisible too; and consequently the subject in which it resides, *i.e.*, the conscious being. Now, upon supposition, that living agent each man calls himself is thus a single being, which there is at least no more difficulty in conceiving than in conceiving it to be a compound, and of which there is no proof now mentioned; it follows that our organised bodies are no more ourselves, or part of ourselves, than any other matter around us."

This argument for the immateriality of the soul, though long regarded as of almost demonstrative force, is now, however, abandoned as of little value, even if it could be proved to be true. It is, moreover, a mere hypothesis, "In calling the soul an element or simple substance," says the present distinguished Archbishop of York, "*what should have been proved is rather assumed;* and the denial of the Materialist, who regards the mind as a compound result of several bodily processes and conditions, would bar this argument as against this form of unbelief." Besides, it takes for granted that there is and can be no alternative between the annihilation of the actual substance, or force, which we call mind or spirit,

* "Immortality." Hulsean Lectures for 1868, p. 110.

Digitized by Google

and the destruction of its consciousness and identity as a living agent! The matter of which the body is composed is not indeed annihilated at death; not a particle of it, in point of fact, ceases to exist, but it does cease to exist as the component elements of a living organised structure. In that respect the body is destroyed—*annihilated;* so far as that, to some minds, horriffic term has any pertinence to the subject. And why may not the same be true in respect to the mind? Allowing that this is an immaterial spiritual substance, and as such essentially different from the body, still, for anything we know, it may be capable of being resolved into some condition as far removed from its present state, as that of the matter of the dissolved organism is from its former living state. The phenomena of sleep and unconsciousness, at all events, show clearly enough that immateriality is no security against the *suspension* of thought and conscious existence, and what greater security can it afford us against the possible *extinction* of them?

Again, it is, to say the least, highly probable, that God himself is the only being who does or can exist in a condition of absolute spirituality. Such was certainly the opinion of many of the early Christian Fathers. "It is worth our inquiry," says Origen, "whether it be possible for rational creatures to remain perfectly incorporeal and separate from all body, when they are arrived to the highest degree of holiness and happiness? or whether they be always of necessity conjoined with some bodies;" and he afterwards plainly affirms it to be impossible, "for any other nature besides the Father, and the Son, and Holy Ghost, to live quite without a body."* "This opinion, that God alone possessed the privilege of living and acting without any body, was formerly entertained," says Mosheim, "not only by Origen, but by most of the Fathers in the first ages of Christianity. And even Origen's adversaries themselves found nothing to reprehend in this opinion."† That great master of erudition, Dr. Ralph Cudworth, himself endorses this opinion, and affirms it "to be a privilege or prerogative proper to the Deity only, to live and act alone, without vital union or conjunction with any body."‡ Among more recent advocates of it may be mentioned the learned George Stanley Faber, and the celebrated preacher, Robert Hall. The former, in his "Many Mansions in the House of the Father," argues in favour of it at some length. In the briefest possible form the argument may be stated thus: God is a spirit (John iv. 24), a spirit wholly unassociated with matter; for we find it farther declared, that "No man hath seen God at any time" (John i. 18; 1 John iv. 12); which must undoubtedly be on the ground of his being a pure spirit, for to see a pure spirit wholly unconnected with matter is a physical impossibility. A disembodied human soul is not, however, thus absolutely invisible. It cannot be said that no one hath seen *it* at any time; since, not to rest the proof on the universal belief in apparitions, though that is not too lightly to be set aside, we have, in the appearance of Samuel at Endor (1 Sam. xxviii. 7—20), and in the fact that the apostle John "*saw* under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God" (Rev. vi. 9), Scripture evidence to the contrary.

* Quoted by CUDWORTH: "Intellectual System," Harrison's edition, Vol. III. pp. 318, 319.

† "Notes to Cudworth," Vol. III. p. 319. As before.

‡ "Cudworth," p. 318. As before.

Digitized by Google

But further, the Omnipresence of God, equally with his invisibility, seems to be inseparably connected with his absolute spirituality. By the Oriental Sages, the Deity was sublimely defined to be a circle, whose centre was everywhere and whose circumference was nowhere. Assuming this definition to be correct, it will seem to follow, speaking with all due reverence, that "the Deity *must* in the very nature and necessity of the case, be a simple spirit, unencumbered by the local limitation of body or parts; for, otherwise, apparently, he could not, by his omnipresence, pervade unlimited space."

"As, then, the Omnipresence of God involves his character of being a simple spirit; so we are carried, I think, by a somewhat similar necessity of involution, to the dogma, that It is the prerogative of the Supreme Being to be the SOLE simple spirit, which either *has* existed, or *does* exist, or *can* exist. We readily perceive the invincible necessity of ONE simple spirit; because without the existence of such a spirit, there could be no Omnipresence of the Deity through the infinitude of space, save in the way of active influence, which is no *proper* omnipresence. Therefore, since the condition of *simple spirit* stands thus, to all appearance, inseparably connected with the condition of *omnipresence*, and since no conceivable necessity for the subsistence of simple spirit exists, save in the solitary, and what cannot but be solitary, case of the illimitable Supreme Being. We seem, even in the way of abstract reasoning, from the anteriorly known premiss that *God is a Spirit;* we seem, I say, brought to the conclusion, that SOLENESS OF SIMPLE SPIRITUALITY *is an incommunicable attribute of the Omnipresent and Omniscient Deity.*"*

In truth, except as thus pervading all space, a supposition only admissible in the case of the Omnipresent Deity, we are utterly unable to conceive of an absolutely pure and uncompounded spirit, as having any relation to locality whatever. To a pure spirit *form* cannot be attributed, yet without form creature existence is an impossibility; for existence is only the form which an essence assumes, or by which, to use the language of philosophy, it is conditioned. To say, therefore, that man, *minus* the body, is a pure spirit and yet not an omnipresent spirit, is in effect to say that he has no existence; for, in the ominous language of Dr. Mason Good: "The mind, or thinking principle, can have no PLACE of existence, it can exist *no*-WHERE; for where, or place, is an idea that cannot be separated from the idea of extension."† Or, to use the expression of a vigorous writer, who has run this theory down to its last dismal absurdity, as soon as a man dies, "*he goes nowhere and becomes nobody.*"

Lastly, this modern and unscriptural theory of the absolute spirituality of the soul would probably never have been elaborated, had it not been conceived to supply the needful basis for the Platonic dogma of the *immortality* of the soul. This was well pointed out by Professor Knapp: "We should mistake very much," observes that able theologian, "if we should suppose that the ancient Israelites, merely because they distinguished widely between soul and body, possessed those strict, metaphysical ideas of the *spirituality* or *immateriality* of the soul, which are prevalent in the modern schools. . . . . The Bible does not support the modern

* "The Many Mansions in the House of the Father," pp. 53—64. Condensed.
† "Book of Nature," Vol. III. p. 7.

Digitized by Google

fine-spun, metaphysical theories respecting the perfect spirituality and immateriality of the soul. The notion of the ancient world respecting *spirit* was by no means the same with that of our modern metaphysicians. And if the question of the perfect immateriality of the soul had been left to them, and theologians had stopped where the Bible does, and omitted these enquiries, the object of which lies far beyond their sphere, they would have done wisely. This doctrine respecting the *immateriality* of the soul, in the strict sense of the term, is of far less consequence than is commonly supposed. The reason why so much importance has been supposed to attach to this doctrine is, that it was considered as essential to the metaphysical proof of the *immortality* of the soul. But since the immateriality of the soul, in the strictest sense, can never be made fully and obviously certain; whatever philosophical arguments may be urged in its favour, the proof of *immortality* should not be built upon it. Nor were the fine-spun theories of Immaterialism ever resorted to by theologians to prove the immortality of the soul, as ascribed by them to the Bible, until Hobbes, Toland, De la Mettrie, and other Materialists, had so perverted the doctrine of Materialism as to deduce from it the destructibility of the soul, or its annihilation at the death of the body."*

The futility of the argument in this regard has, moreover, been conclusively shown. The great German philosopher, Kant, took it up, and it crumbled into dust in his hands. "He showed," says Mr. Heard, "that while the soul could not cease to exist by any diminution of its extensive quality, that the argument, from its simplicity, did not exclude its extinction through the gradual weakening of its forces, and the successive relaxation of its intensive quantity. For even memory has always a degree which may be indefinitely decreased—so of self-consciousness, and so of all the other faculties. Hence there is nothing to prevent a simple substance from being resolved into several simple substances, and several simple substances from flowing together into one, which would contain within itself the degree of the reality of all the preceding substances together."†

It has also been repeatedly pointed out that if the *immateriality* of the human soul necessarily implies man's immortality; then, inasmuch as it is the plain teaching of Scripture that the lower animals possess souls (see Gen. i. 20, 21, 24, etc.), and these souls differ from human souls not in kind but capacity; seeing that they as truly as ourselves manifest memory, imagination, desire, anger, gratitude, etc., it will follow, *pari passu*, that they also must be immortal. Hence it will appear that "the fact of immateriality, supposing it to be established, is of no logical value in the present argument, unless to a reasoner who, not shrinking from assuming a major of most portentous dimensions, will affirm that all mind is immortal, because immaterial." On this supposition, the region of immortality must indeed be immensely extended; and not only may we no longer deem it any evidence of a 'rude untutored mind' that 'the poor Indian' should

> "think, admitted to an equal sky,
> His faithful dog shall bear him company."

---

* "Lectures on Christian Theology," translated by Dr. Leonard Woods, Art. V. § 51.

† "Tripartite Nature of Man," p. 234.

Digitized by Google

But, more difficult conception by far, every hurtful and noxious reptile must be conceded an eternity in which to manifest its repulsiveness and uselessness.

This part of the subject cannot, however, be enlarged upon here, nor is it needful. The reader whose patience has accompanied us thus far, must bear in mind that all that has hitherto been advanced either against Materialism or Immaterialism, has been merely negative, aud intended to show the inherent weakness and falsity of those theories. The positive argument against both alike is embodied in the counter-theory, that of the *Bible Psychologist*, which has yet to be presented. If this can be proved to be in accordance with Scripture and reason, its establishment will of necessity involve the overthrow of those which we have considered. This must, however, be reserved for our concluding paper.

Birkenhead. W. MAUDE.

THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS.*

WE closed our last article in the *Rainbow* for September with stating that, while there is a material difference between the death of man and the death of the lower creatures of God; there is also, as the book of Ecclesiastes and other Scriptures affirm, a similarity in their deaths of so strong a kind that they are one and the same: "A man hath no pre-eminence above a beast!" Now, this is a statement at which many stumble. It is peculiarly offensive to thinkers of the Augustinian and Origenistic schools. With them the death of beasts is *their loss of life;* with them the death of man is *"a certain condition of existence,"* or life. The beasts in dying lose their being and existence: man in dying only alters his manner of existence. We will proceed to show that this view of theirs is unscriptural, and that the description of death in the book of Ecclesiastes is conformable to the rest of Scripture on this vital question.

We think that the error against which we here contend arises from a false view of the nature of man, and consequently a false definition of man as an animal. When Mr. Jukes defines man, his definition is, *"Man is a spirit."* (p. 69; *Rainbow*, p. 308.) It is quite plain that Mr. Jukes's view of man is substantially one with that of Plato. Plato makes the soul the essence of man, the body an accident of which death rids him to his great advantage. Without saying that Mr. Jukes goes so far as Plato, we have no doubt, from his own words and general teaching, that he takes very much of his view. At all events, we quarrel with his definition of man as given above.

We do not deny that man *has* a spirit, or soul, or question the importance of this his possession. But the beasts also have spirit, and their

---

* "The Second Death and the Restitution of all Things." By Andrew Jukes. Second edition. London: Longmans. 1869. "Doctrine of Annihilation," *Rainbow* of July, 1869. By Ditto.

Digitized by Google

possession of spirit is as of just as much consequence to them as our possession of spirit is to us. Mr. Jukes does not deny to the beasts their possession of soul and spirit. (*Rainbow*, p. 312.) Indeed, he could not do so without contradicting Scripture, which declares that they have. It would be just as accurate, therefore, to say "a beast is a spirit," as to say "man is a spirit." Both have spirit, but spirit is not the definition of either one or other, is not the definition of man more than it is the definition of beast.

If we go to Scripture for our definition of man, we will obtain a much more lowly idea and definition of him than that of Mr. Jukes. According to Scripture, "*man is earth.*" We think we hear the cry of *materialism.* We are not afraid of any cry while we hold fast to the only source of truth on questions such as these, namely, that God, telling us in his word the nature of the creature of his hands. That description we accept as true, no matter whether it offends human pride or not; no matter to what sounding charge it may expose us.

We will go back for a few moments to God's account of man's creation. We read, "*God formed man of the dust of the ground.*" (Gen. ii. 7.) There is the origin and the nature of man—*all he was at the first.* It is true that afterwards God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and so man became a living soul, or living creature. It is also true that without this breath of God man was devoid of life. *But still the lifeless figure was man before it had received any breath of life from God.* This is not our teaching, it is what Moses tells us, and if we accept his teaching, we cannot deny it. It is the light also in which writers who differ from us wholly on the subject of future punishment, have taken. Thus, Augustine, commenting on Genesis ii. 7, says of man that, up to the inbreathing of God, "*man was only body*;" and Tertullian says, "*he was already man who as yet was only dust.*"* From the account, therefore, given of man at his creation, we have this definition of him, "*man is dust.*" Mr. Jukes says, "man is spirit;" the Bible says, "man is dust."

But it may, perhaps, be said, that while this is a true definition of him up to the period of God's breathing into him the breath of life, it ceased to be a true definition of him ever after that. Even from this refuge we are driven by authority which we dare not deny. The old definition of him, given before he had received the breath of life, is renewed by God himself after he had become "a living soul." God comes to Adam on his sin, and reminds him of his lowly origin, and tells him that what he was then he is now: "*Dust thou art, and unto* dust shalt thou return." (Gen. iii. 17.) We hear no high sounding words from man's Maker about his being "soul" or "spirit." The Creator, at the very time when man had within him the breath of life derived from himself, *tells him that he is but dust.* We may, if we like, quarrel with this definition of man, and prefer that of a Greek philosopher, or a Christian father, but if we do so, we are certainly taking the word of man in preference to the word of God.

So we find it throughout the Scriptures. Abraham is interceding for Sodom. The creature is in the presence of his Maker, the God whom he knew as "the God of the spirits of all flesh," whether of man or beast. (Num. xvi. 22.) Abraham knew this Great Being as a Spirit, but he did

* Augustine. De. Gen. i. 147. Tertullian. De. Resur. v. 328.

Digitized by Google

not so think or define himself; his humble words were, "Behold, I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, *which am but dust and ashes.*" (Gen. xviii. 27.)

Once more, let us turn to the chamber of the widow of Zarephath. Death has entered the household which had received to its hospitality Elijah the prophet of God. The soul has left the body of the widow's only child. What lay on the bosom of the miserable mother was only earth such as we tread under our feet. The soul, the principle of life, that which had lightened those glazed eyes, and coloured those white features, and given motion to those stiffened limbs, was away in the mysterious, invisible land of Hades. And yet what lay on the widow's bosom was "the child" of her heart's affection; the man whom with joy she had seen born into the world. And so Elijah looked on it. "Give me thy child," he said to her, *and she handed him "dust and ashes."* It was "dust and ashes" that he carried into his own room, and laid on his own bed, *and called the widow's child.* And how did he regard the soul? As something which had once dwelt in the child, still belonged to the child, might again animate the child, but yet was not the child who there stiff, and cold, and lifeless, was yet the widow's child. "O Lord, my God," was the prophet's prayer, *"let this child's soul come into him again."*

The review of these passages from Scripture enables us at the same time to give the true definition of man, and to correct Mr. Jukes's definition of him. According to Mr. Jukes, "man is spirit, and has body;" according to Scripture, "man is body, and has spirit or soul." The original man is body alone; and the body, even after it has received the breath of life, is regarded in Scripture as the true representation of the man.

And thus we see that the death of man and beast is, as the book of Ecclesiastes tells us expressly, one and the same death. Both are dust: and when the spirit of life has left each, the dust has ceased to be living, animated dust, and differs in no respect from the clods of the valley. Man in death has lost his true and proper existence, which is not that of spirit, but of body animated by spirit. Death, in man's case, as in that of beasts, is *not* "a condition of existence." Without the resurrection of the body, according to Paul, *man would perish.* (1 Cor. xv. 18, 19.)

But we also hold a very material difference between the death of man and the death of beasts, *as regards the spirit which animated both.* In regard of beasts, we believe that at death their spirits cease to exist. Made only for a temporary life, that which gave life to them ceases to possess life as soon as the creature whom it animated has ceased to exist. So, on the authority of God, we do not believe of the spirit of any man, good or bad, when what we call the first death has killed him. Though made for the body, the spirit is far nobler than the body. It is the spirit which animates the body, and gives to it animal, intellectual, and moral life. It is the subtle essence which pervades it, and which makes man the noble creature that he is, the nobler creature that he was when first he became a living soul. It is this spirit of life, we believe, that maintains that conscious identity which makes us feel ourselves to be the same man amid the ever-changing composition of our bodies, and which will make us, whether good or evil, feel ourselves to be the same men when we awake at the trumpet's call out of the dust of the ground. Man's spirit, therefore, or soul, as it is generally called, does not cease to exist when the body dies.

Digitized by Google

It enters on its Hades state, there to assume a new office in the marvellous providence of God, to be the connecting link, as it was and will be the animating principle of the bodies which died, and which shall rise again. In this separate region, and as serving this all-important office, the separate spirit is looked on as a second representation of the man to whom it belongs. As the lifeless body is truly the man, so also the living spirit, in whatever condition of life it lives, is in a true, though derived and secondary sense, said in Scripture to be also the man.

But while we hold this as a precious truth of Scripture, and so hold that, while in death all that had ever belonged to the beast dies, in death all that belonged to man does not die, we do not see the smallest ground in Scripture for supposing that in announcing death as the penalty of sin man *at the first knew* that there would be any difference whatever between his death and that of the beasts. So far as we can judge he could have known of no difference whatsoever. Nor have we the smallest reason for supposing that even after his sin, and God's promise of redemption, he knew that there would be any difference. God's promise to him through the seed of the woman was the promise of *restoration.* It concerned mainly and especially the original man made of the dust of the ground. *The resurrection of the body to eternal life was the grand promise made in Eden,* and it contained no intimation as to what should happen to the spirit that had animated the body between death and resurrection. It might perish as that of brutes, or might exist in a state of sleep, or might exercise faculties of its own on the objects surrounding and affecting it in its separate state. Nothing of this was conveyed to Adam in the words that did convey to him the certainty that the work of the serpent should be undone by the woman's seed. The Hades state seems to be a state that grew into human knowledge, as revelation advanced in its disclosure, until the revelation of Jesus Christ gave us such an amount of knowledge as we are now possessed of.

It is this Hades state which constitutes the difference between the death of man and that of beasts. It seems to be a state linked with man's sin and with man's redemption. It is the consequence undoubtedly of sin, and a part of sin's curse and punishment, for without sin many spirits would never have entered the state of Hades at all. It seems with equal certainty linked with and produced by the redemption of Christ, for if it were not for the redemption of man from the power of the grave, the spirit of man would not have been preserved in existence any more than the spirit of the beast. But in whatever condition it is there preserved, whether one of conscious life or of unconscious sleep, this, its continued existence of which we are assured, does not prevent man's death from being a death of the very same kind as the death of beasts, viz., the loss of existence to the original and proper man, made of earth, by God's withdrawal from him of his animating spirit.

It is indeed strange to hear men with the Scriptures in their hands maintaining, as Mr. Jukes does, that "death nowhere in the word of God means non-existence, but always a certain condition of existence." (*Rainbow,* 307.) This we have shown at some length in the preceding pages to be untrue in regard of man's primary idea of death, and in regard of the death threatened and actually inflicted on himself. If we will here take God's word as our guide, instead of the old Pythagorian

Digitized by Google

and Platonic speculations upon human nature, in place of holding that there is no true resemblance between the death of man and the death of beasts, we will hold that "one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth so dieth the other:" and therefore that as the death of beasts is their "non-existence," so is that of man.

But Mr. Jukes's idea of death *as a condition of existence* is not only opposed to the original idea of it in Scripture, but to the whole tone and language of Scripture from first to last. According to Mr. Jukes death is always in Scripture *some kind of life*, and it is exactly according to the state of the mind of the person who is said to die, that it depends whether his death is entering on a *better life or a worse* than he had lived before. Thus the death of Adam when he fell was, according to Mr. Jukes, "having the divine life in his soul poisoned and destroyed" (p. 69); while the death of the fallen sinner "is his being delivered in spirit from sin, that is the dark world, and in body from the toils and changes of this outward world." (p. 70.) It will be thus seen that Mr. Jukes holds death in its Scripture usage to mean always a condition of life or existence, and sometimes a condition of life far better than the life which had preceded it Now, we venture to say, this is quite contrary to Scripture usage. Death when spoken of absolutely is always opposite to life in Scripture, and represented as inferior to life. It is not spoken of as a species of life, a condition, good or bad, of life. It is spoken of as life's opposite, so that where one is the other is not, where one has existed the other has departed, where one is restored the other is banished. Thus Moses, speaking to Israel in the wilderness, says, "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil." (Deut. xxx. 18.) Death, with Moses, was as much the opposite of life, as evil was of good. Job in his misery said, "My soul chooseth death rather than life." (Chap. vii. 15.) Life to him was misery, death to him was the loss of misery as being the loss of life. So Jeremiah says, "Death shall be chosen rather than life by all the residue of this evil family." (Chap. viii. 3.) Why? Because it is freedom from misery in being freedom or separation from life. "Have I any pleasure," saith God in the Book of Ezekiel, "that the wicked should die, and not that he should return from his sin and live?" (Chap. xviii. 23.) We thus see that Scripture speaks of death in exactly the same way that it is spoken of in common life, not as a "condition of existence" or life, but as the direct opposite of existence or life.

But we freely allow that death has in Scripture applications and senses different from what we have above shown to be its primary application and sense. Every word in much use has this variety of sense distinguishable by the context of the immediate passage where it occurs, and by the nature of the book which speaks of it. It would be strange if death were not thus variously used in Scripture. But in the first place, it is only used in Scripture with the very same latitude that it is used in other writings; and in the next place, in all their various uses it carries out its original sense, signifying the non-existence of feelings or relations that once had existence.

Thus with respect to the latitude of application of the word, we find Euripides applying it in various ways. In one place he makes Hecuba, worn out with grief after grief coming on her aged head, exclaim, "I for my part am *dead through misery before the time of death.*" We here

Digitized by Google

readily see that in the very same sentence death is used in different yet kindred senses. In the latter clause of the sentence it has its common sense in ordinary speech, viz., the loss of physical existence. In the former clause, it is used figuratively to express by a powerful image the utter loss of all which had made life desirable, and consequently *the non-existence of all those feelings* with which the once-joyous wife of Priam had regarded life when, queen, wife, and mother, life's blessings were freely poured into her lap. Similar instances could readily be brought, drawn chiefly from passages which describe highly wrought feeling of suffering and anguish. Now in Scripture we often find death thus used. When it is spoken of simply and absolutely, it refers to the common meaning, the loss of physical life. But it is too powerful an image not to be often used in reference to feelings and relations in the spiritual life of man. It is applied to these with marked effect. But we can as readily here distinguish the primary and secondary senses, as we do in the above passage from a Greek play, and in every one of them the phrase carries out the idea, viz., the *non-existence of what once had life.* This we will now show from the examples which Mr. Jukes himself brings forward.

Mr. Jukes asks us, "When Adam's spirit died to God, was this annihilation?" (*Rainbow*, p. 306.) We have already pointed out the real, though unintentional unfairness, of such questions as this. We do not for one moment suppose that when Adam died to God, his physical existence ceased. We do not require therefore to be asked the question as if we did. The question put might as well be asked of Euripides in regard to Hecuba's exclamation, when Hecuba exclaimed that she was dead, did this mean annihilation? Euripides would have replied, that he did not attach this meaning to the death which Hecuba, still living, had said she died, and that ordinary attention to his words would have showed that he did not. In the same way we reply that we do not mean by such a term as Adam's death to God what Mr. Jukes calls annihilation, but what we prefer to call non-existence or physical death; and that we think our words carefully considered ought not to be supposed to imply anything of the kind. But at the same time, we do say that while Adam's death to God, when he fell into sin, did not mean *the loss of his physical life,* it did mean *the loss of his spiritual life, its ceasing to be, its non-existence.* Love, and duty, and loyalty, were the feelings of Adam's spirit as long as he continued in the condition in which he was made. When he fell from this condition, these once prevailing sentiments of his nature *died within him, or ceased to have their former existence.* And thus we see the secondary sense of death exactly carrying out the primary, and signifying the non-existence or loss of existence of *a life* which he had before. "Our death in trespasses and sins," which Mr. Jukes goes on to ask about, is of the same nature as Adam's death to God, and therefore need not be dwelt upon.

We will now consider another of Mr. Jukes's questions. He asks us, "is our death to sin annihilation?" (*Rainbow*, p. 306.) Here, again, Mr. Jukes supposes that writers upon our side hold that "death to sin" means *the loss of physical existence and life!* We do not know where he could find a passage of any of our writings to justify such an insinuation. We will simply say for ourselves, that we have never met anywhere with anything of the kind. But we do say that our "death to sin" is the cessation of a life which we formerly lived, *its non-existence,* or as Mr. Jukes would term it,

Digitized by Google

its annihilation. One who has studied Scripture so closely as Mr. Jukes has, might readily remember a very high authority there for what we have just stated. It is the authority of St. Paul; he, too, asks questions. One of his questions is "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" His answer is, "God forbid. How shall we that *are dead to sin live any longer therein?*" (Rom. vi. 1, 2.) Here we see that Paul meant by our death to sin, our ceasing any longer to live the life of sin. So death, here as elsewhere, *is the loss of a life*—here a blessed loss, even the loss of that wicked life which leads to the blotting out of the sinner from the Book and Land of Life. The secondary sense here, too, is based on the primary. It means the extinction of a life which once was lived, *its non-existence.*

We thus find that the meaning of death in Scripture is *always* "non-existence." It does not always indeed mean the loss of physical life, because it has a great variety of applications; but it always does mean the loss of whatever life it is applied to. Death to sin is our ceasing to live the life of sin; death to God is our ceasing to live the holy loving life he quickened in us; death, taken simply and absolutely, is our ceasing to possess the physical life with which God endowed us. This is its meaning when not obviously applied in some secondary sense. It is its meaning when God says to the wicked, "O wicked man, thou shalt surely die;" when Paul declares, "the wages of sin is death."

And, indeed, as it is almost impossible always to avoid the use of words in their true and ordinary meaning, so we sometimes find Mr. Jukes using this word "death," not as a condition of existence or life, but as a thing quite distinct from life. Thus, at page 71, he says, "In pressing this point, however, that death is needful for the sinner's deliverance, I need scarcely add, *that death alone, and without another life,* is not, and cannot of itself, be enough to bring us back to God's world." Generally, Mr. Jukes uses death as synonymous with some species of life, but here he candidly allows that it is quite distinct from life, which is all that we have contended for.

We have dwelt for a long time, but not we think too long, on the meaning of death. It is with our opponents of the schools of Augustine and Origen a vital point to alter its sense in Scripture, and to make it in God's word mean the direct opposite to that which it ordinarily means. In common human language, death and life are opposites. Death means absence of life: the presence of life implies the absence of death. This common view Mr. Jukes and others labour to show is not the view of Scripture. In Scripture, they insist, that death is a "condition of existence," or, in plain words, that death is life in one shape or another. We think we have shown this not to be the case, and in doing so have vindicated the great and fundamental truth on which the value of Scripture as man's guide depends, namely, that its language and that of common life are not different, but one and the same. It is in vain to attempt to disconnect them. And if one succeeded in the attempt, its effect would be to destroy the value of Scripture for common men and women, and to hand it over as a field on which the wildest imaginations of the fanatic and the visionary could disport themselves without check or hindrance. As we claim for our English translation of the Bible to be part and parcel of our English tongue, so we claim for the Greek of our New Testament to be part and

Digitized by Google

parcel of the grand language which Grecian intellect and arms had made to be the world's tongue in the lifetime of Christ and his apostles. Daily experience shows us our urgent need of this powerful check on the exuberant fancies of the imagination. We now proceed to consider Mr. Jukes's principal arguments for his theory of universal restitution.

All men who have ever lived will, according to Mr. Jukes, be brought, at some period or other, to the blessed life which was lost by man at his fall. Some are thus brought in this present age or world: these he calls "the first born." But those who are not thus brought now will be brought hereafter through the agency of the first-born. He supposes that there will be hereafter successive ages or dispensations, during which this restoring process will be going on until, all restored, these ages or dispensations will close, their work being done. This process of restoration, he supposes to be through death, and judgment, and destruction, which, with him, all have one and the same character, being the means and way to life. Through the first and second death, *both* of which he thinks must be undergone by all, whether first-born or late-born, life and salvation are attained. Such is his theory. We will give his own statement of it, as found in pages 27, 28. Speaking of the will of God as "to the process and stages of redemption," he states it to be thus:—

(1.) First, his will by some to bless and save others; by a first-born seed, "the first-born from the dead" to save and bless the later-born.

(2.) His will, therefore, to work out the redemption of the lost by successive ages or dispensations, or, to use the language of St. Paul, according to the purpose of the ages. (Eph. iii. 11.)

(3.) Lastly, his will—thus meeting the nature of our fall—to make death, judgment, and destruction, the means and way to life, acquittal, and salvation; in other words, through death, to destroy him that has the power of death, that is the devil, and to deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. (Heb. ii. 14.)

We think that we will best show the fallacy of this theory by the following way. We will first show that destruction, or death, is not, as he contends, a way to restitution, or the restored life of the creature who is destroyed: and we will here consider both his appeal to Scripture and to nature. We will then proceed to examine what he means by the first and second deaths, and show that the view he gives of them is quite different from that of Scripture. If we succeed in these points, we shall have overthrown the main argument of his very ingenious but most fallacious work.

Destruction and death have the same meaning with Mr. Jukes. *According to their application*, they are regarded by him as good or evil, blessing or curse. Thus death to Adam, as Adam came from God, was evil; by it, "the divine life in man's soul was poisoned and destroyed, and man was separated from God, and died to God's world." (p. 69.) But death or destruction, as applied to the sinful and the fallen race of man, is a blessing of the highest kind. No matter with what pain or trouble it may be accompanied, its result is salvation. As it was by death that men fell out of God's world, so he thinks that by death they are to "return to God." (p. 70.) With the death by which he supposes man to have fallen from God, Mr. Jukes does not occupy much of his work. It is with the death by which he returns to God that he is chiefly concerned. And this

Digitized by Google

death, whether it be the first or second death, is, according to his theory, a blessing of the very highest kind, which all must undergo in order to return to God, and which all do undergo at some period or other of their existence. Death, *as it relates to the sinful*, is always in Scripture, according to him, a blessing issuing in eternal joy and peace.

We will first consider Mr. Jukes's confident appeal to the analogy of nature for his theory that destruction is a usual way with God for the renewal of life. Our theory, it will be remembered is this. We suppose some of God's creatures to have fallen out of their allotted place, to have ceased to serve the end God designed for them, and as a consequence to be removed by God as useless out of existence. Mr. Jukes supposes that such a process will never take place; that all men, however fallen, who have ever had existence will always continue to have it, and that nature, in her processes of destruction and death, affords an analogy of the manner by which such fallen men are restored to the better life which they had for a period lost. Let us examine the nature to which he appeals. We are ever ready to acknowledge her voice as, in its place, the voice of God. But an examination of nature will only show beyond a doubt that if her voice is to be listened to, our theory, and not that of Mr. Jukes, is the one she teaches. "Present nature," observes Mr. Jukes, "is both the witness and mirror of man's present state. But to say that nature out of this failure or destruction cannot and does not bring forth *other and often fairer forms of life*—that what here fails of its due end is therefore wholly lost, or for ever shut up in the imperfect form in which it dies and fails here—is opposed to fact and all philosophy." (p. 102.) And this process of nature he brings forward as an illustration of the manner by which sinners, who here refused the offers of salvation, shall hereafter, through "fire," through their dissolution and destruction by fire, be restored to the original state from which they had fallen, or to one yet higher. (pp. 103—4.)

Now, we do not object to his description of the process of nature, at least to that part of it which is clearly expressed and which we understand. We believe that nature in her wondrous chemistry does bring forth out of destruction, "other and fairer forms of life" than those which had been destroyed; and we also believe that nothing made is "wholly lost." But a very slight consideration will show that the "nature" which Mr. Jukes here evokes to his aid does not afford the slightest analogy *to his theory*. He contends for *the perpetual existence of the individual, and its restoration, through destruction, to its former perfection.* What does nature speak of such a process? Not a word in favour of it, but instances without number in contradiction of it. She gives birth in her process of destruction to "other and often fairer forms of life," but no second birth to the old lost form of life. She uses the materials of the old creation in the formation of new, but not in the re-formation of the old. Old organizations with her perish, not to be renewed, but to enter into fresh ones. Mr. Jukes contends for the continued identity of man through all his changes; nature exhibits nothing of this in her infinity of transformation. It is not natural, common, that that which dies in nature lives again. It is contrary to nature, opposed to experience. Where do we see it? When does the tree that has been struck by lightning, or died out through age, sprout out again? Never! When does the bird that has poured out its last melody upon the air, again feel the gushing tide of song and delight the

Digitized by Google

ear of its mate once more? Never! When does the horse that has breathed out its life feel his strength again to return, and his neck to be clothed with thunder, and his nostrils to smell the battle afar off? Never! The race may continue, new individuals may come into being, but the old individual life is gone for ever. And the same holds good of races, as of individuals, when their time has come. Where are the departed fauna and flora which the science of geology speaks of as once having existed but as existing no longer? Gone for ever! We see their shapes in the rocks; we sometimes come upon their remains in some old cave of the earth; but the race has gone never to appear again. The fact then is that nature does not testify to the renewal or restoration of individual life after death. In her thousand aspects, in her thousand voices, she speaks a contrary language. With her, that which is dead does not live again.

Surely man's treatment of the great question of resurrection of the body is proof of the manner in which man has read the ever-present testimony of nature. Beyond any question, bodily resurrection was the very essence of the promise made by God to Adam in Eden; and that it was a doctrine of primitive religion we see from its mention in the book of Job. But the tradition of the resurrection, opposed to the voice of universal nature, died out among men. There was nothing in the world around them to sustain their faith. Nature spoke the contrary, and she was heard. Accordingly the resurrection of the body never took its place in purely natural religion. Man speculated for a future for his soul *because* he supposed it did not die when his body died. Man never speculated about a resurrection of the body; it could never enter into his working practical thoughts. *That the dead should live again* was in no age or religion even a notion, except where that notion came down from above from him who alone kills and makes alive again. The very idea of resurrection is proof of the presence of divine revelation. God alone could inspire the faltering tongue to say, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake, and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." (Isa. xxvi. 19.) It is only because he spoke thus that we thus believe. Nature taught or suggested nothing of the kind.

The only example in nature, and one which is accordingly laid hold of eagerly by Mr. Jukes and his school, that affords any apparent analogy, is drawn from the sowing of *seed* on the ground and its bearing a crop. (1 Cor. xv. 36; John xii. 24.) The seed is sown in the ground, it is there said to die; and in thus dying, it sprouts out and bears fruit of its own kind manifold. But many things must be considered in this process. The seed must have in it a living germ; the seed must be sound. The process in the ground has not killed this germ, but has only quickened it from dormancy to active life. What is called its death is only the putrefaction of the substance which surrounded the living germ. If this latter had been killed, if the whole seed had putrified, there never would have been life or growth from the seed. Seeds that *are really dead* never send up a living growth. Destruction in nature never restores life to that which is destroyed. In the lowest branches of vegetable life, in the lowest or the highest organisations of animal life, we see no instance of life being restored to that which has been destroyed. Nature says that such a process is not hers to perform.

Digitized by Google

Restoration, then, after destruction can only come from God, and his promise is the only reason for supposing that such restoration will ever take place. His general law is the other way. The belief in it is no deduction from reason, is no argument from analogy; it is God's peculiar office to reveal it, and the part of faith to accept it. So David thought when he said, "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" (Psa. lxxxviii. 10—12.) That which Mr. Jukes supposes agreeable to a great universal law of nature—that which he supposes will come to man through a process such as is readily seen in the world around us—David, half doubtful, accepted only as a marvellous thing which he could only entertain because it was promised by the Almighty Worker who, where nature has come to her extremest limits, and can do nought for man, steps in for his elect's sake, and for his faithful promise in Christ, and exhibits his faithfulness *even in destruction*, giving back life where nature, in all her multiform processes, *never* had done so.

Restoration, then, not *through* destruction or death, but *from* destruction, we believe when, and only when, God directly promises it. Nature never warrants our expecting it. Revelation only can entitle us to believe it. Of course where *it* does, there we do expect it. We believe in the resurrection of the bodies of Christ's people to eternal life, because God has promised this. We believe in the resurrection of the bodies of the wicked to their old mortal life, because God has promised this for the exhibition of his judgment and justice. But with regard to the second death and the destruction of the sinner after judgment, we do not believe that there will be any restoration or renewal, because God not only has not promised this, but because he has in the plainest language declared that it will *not* take place. Knowing the efforts that would be made to neutralise his most solemn warnings to the sinner, knowing that men would arise promising life where he had not promised, he has affixed to his threatenings of the second death and destruction of the wicked in hell, an adjective which forbids us to hope for any renewal of life whatsoever. But on the true meaning of the word αιωνιος, translated in our version, "everlasting," and applied to the destruction of the sinner hereafter, we have not time here to dwell. We hope to bring it forward in our next article which, concluding our review of Mr. Jukes, will chiefly refer to his theory of "The Second Death."

HENRY CONSTABLE,
Prebendary of Cork.

Desertmore Glebe.

Digitized by Google

THE ETERNITY OF EVIL.

FINDING that great misconception prevails with regard to the views propounded in a course of sermons lately preached at Eaton Chapel, I think it well to give the following summary of them.

1. Scriptures declares, that the "everlasting punishment" of the wicked will consist of "everlasting destruction," after, or by means of the infliction of "many" or "few stripes," according to their several deserts. The popular theory teaches, that it will consist of everlasting pain.

2. Scripture declares, that God will "destroy both body and soul in hell." The popular theory teaches, that he will destroy neither one nor the other; but preserve both of them alive for ever, in unmitigated agony.

3. Scripture declares, that "our God is a consuming fire." The popular theory teaches, that he is only a scorching fire.

4. Scripture declares, that the "fiery indignation" will "devour the adversaries." The popular theory teaches, that it will do no such thing, but only torture them.

5. Scripture declares, that the wicked will perish "like natural brute beasts." The popular theory teaches, that there will be no analogy whatever between the two cases.

6. Scripture declares, that whosoever "will save his life" by unfaithfulness to Christ, shall ultimately "lose it" in a far more terrible manner. The popular theory teaches, that no man can lose his life more than once, and that "the second death" is no death at all, but eternal life in sin and misery.

7. Scripture declares, that whosoever "doeth the will of God abideth for ever." The popular theory teaches, that every man will abide for ever, whether he does the will of God or not.

8. Scripture declares, that if we desire "immortality" we must seek it "by patient continuance in well doing." The popular theory teaches, that every man possesses inherent indefeasible immortality, and what we have to seek for is, that it may prove a blessing and not a curse to us.

9. Scripture declares, that "the wages of sin is death." The popular theory teaches, that it is eternal life in misery; in other words, that God will inflict upon impenitent sinners a punishment *infinitely greater* than what he has pronounced to be their due.

10. Scripture declares, that "the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." The popular theory teaches, that eternal life is the common possession of all men, and that the gift of God through Christ is the privilege of spending it in holiness and happiness.

11. Scripture declares, that "the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil." The popular theory teaches, that they will never be destroyed at all, but that a portion of the universe will be specially set apart for the eternal exhibition of them in their fullest maturity.

12. Scripture declares, that Christ is to "reconcile all things to God." The popular theory teaches, that all things will *never* be reconciled to God; that discord and disorder will never *cease*, but only be confined to one particular locality.

Digitized by Google

13. Scripture declares that in Christ "all things consist." The popular theory teaches, that a whole kingdom will "consist" for ever, although *not* "in him."

14. Scripture declares, that "he that hath the Son hath life, but he that hath not the Son of God hath not life," that "if we live after the flesh we shall die, but if through the spirit we mortify the deeds of the body we shall live." The advocates of the popular theory say, that the life of believers and unbelievers, of natural men and spiritual men, must be of equal duration—that the doctrine of eternal happiness, and the doctrine of eternal misery must stand or fall together—in other words, that if what the Scripture asserts be true, what it denies must be true also.

I take my stand, therefore, on the plain, consistent, emphatic teaching of the whole Bible from beginning to end, as opposed to the "traditions of men," which have so grievously perverted it, and thereby obscured the glory of Christ, reduced to an unmeaning form the declaration that "God is Love," produced a frightful amount of infidelity, robbed the law of its terrors by making it threaten sinners with what they are sure will never be executed, incalculably weakened the saving power of the gospel, and damaged the believer's whole spiritual constitution, by putting an unnatural strain upon it that God never intended it to bear.

The three or four passages that are thought to confirm the traditional view have been examined in a volume entitled "The Glory of Christ in the Creation and Reconciliation of all things" (Longman), and been found either entirely to fail in lending it even the appearance of support, or to be but as dust in the balance against the overpowering weight of testimony on the other side.

Incumbent of Eaton Chapel, Eaton Square. SAMUEL MINTON.

JOHN THE BAPTIST IN PRISON.

"I must decrease."

John.—What meaneth this? The kingdom near at hand,
And I in prison? Can I be deceived?
Did I not witness in the wilderness?
And pour baptismal water upon thousands?
Did I not testify of coming wrath,
And tell the people, though the *wheat* be garnered,
The *chaff* should be burnt up in quenchless fire?
Have I not pointed out the Lamb of God,
And seen the Spirit descend from opened heavens,
Taking its rest upon him? Then why *here?*
Shall not the rebels be purged out from Israel,
And great Messiah take his rightful throne?
Has he not come to choose his "Bride" at once,
And take his "friends" to fellowship in glory?
It *is* the Son of God! It *must* be him
Of whom both Moses and the prophets wrote!
And yet the wicked seem in power, not Jesus!
Herod sends for me, though I am in prison,
Hears me with gladness, though I tell him truth
Which neither flatters him nor his vile ways,
Yet no deliverance comes! Does Jesus know it?

Digitized by Google

Can I have been the herald of that One
Whose might is such, he'll save or he'll destroy;
And yet be left to perish in this dungeon?
I am perplexed. God's ways are yet mysterious.
Am I to be like Job, tried first, and then exalted?

ENTER TWO DISCIPLES.

Most glad am I this visit is permitted—
Haste ye to Jesus, for my heart is troubled;
From his own lips get answer to this question—
"Art thou the *real* Messiah, or are we
Still to remain expectants of another?"

* * *

What said the Master? Did his anger burn?
Disc.—Nay, but with gentlest grace he answered us:
He healed some lepers, gave sight to some blind,
Healed many sick, yea, raised some dead to life,
And then he preached glad tidings to the poor,
Glad tidings of the "*kingdom*," when the wicked
Are to be utterly destroyed; whilst those
Who take their cross, and follow him in love,
Shall have their place in *that* regeneration.
Blessed are those who do not stumble at him;
For he is the "Stone," and those who build not on him
Will, as the enemies, be crushed to powder!
We turned away, though fain would we have lingered;
And, as we came to thee, we heard him say—
"Among those born of women is no *greater*
Than the renowned prophet, John the Baptist."
John.—That was just like him! Oh, my blessed Master,
Pardon the one misgiving I have had of thee!
The Bridegroom's "friend" shall yet rejoice in glory.

* * * *

ENTER EXECUTIONER.

What meaneth this grim messenger?
Exec.— I come
At Herod's bidding to behead thee, Baptist.
John.—Behead me! 'Twas but yesterday he *heard* me.
Why is this? Wherein have I offended him?
Exec.—You have stirred the wrath of one as vile as Jezebel,
A cruel woman who can ne'er forgive.
John.—Herodias?
Exec.—And her daughter. She, this night,
Was dancing in the presence of the king;
When, overcome with wine and admiration,
He told her to ask anything she pleased.
She asked your *head*—"*John Baptist's head in a charger.*"
John.—*His* words have fitted me to meet mine *end!*
I am not "stumbled," heaven's kingdom is "at hand."
In Paradise I shall await it. Strike the blow!
I came *before* him in my birth, and witness,
Now, in my death, I go *before* him too.
For die he will;—as Lamb of God he'll die;
And by his death make sacrifice for sin.
O meek and lowly One, I crave thy Spirit—
That I may say IN DEATH, God's WILL BE DONE.

W. C. B.

Digitized by Google

Literature.

Life and Death; as taught in Scripture. London: Elliot Stock.

WE are glad to see that the view which we and others have advocated in the *Rainbow* of this year, relative to the future of the wicked, is not without its able advocates across the Atlantic. It was not until very lately that our attention was drawn to the above work, and we can only wonder, after having read it, that it has not attracted very considerable attention in this country. It well deserves it. Without absolutely adopting every view put forward in it, or every argument by which its views are supported, we have no hesitation in saying that it is a work ably and vigorously written, and with whose general conclusions we most heartily agree.

"Life and Death" forms, we understand, the second part of a larger work published in the United States of America, under the title of "Adventism: What is it?" Its author is Mr. William Sheldon, a gentleman well known in the Western States in connection with the religious press. We have not seen the larger work, and here speak only of its second part. In reproducing it in this country some alterations were made in its style, to render it more suited to English taste, and a prefatory note was added. In all other respects it remains unchanged.

The larger work, of which it forms a part, has, we hear, commanded a large sale in America. We trust that the work which we now commend to the attention of the British public, will also shortly do the same. Having ourselves for years past closely considered its all-important subject, we consider ourselves able to form a sound opinion of its advocacy by others. We gladly hail Mr. Sheldon's book as a most valuable addition to our literature on the subject, recommend it strongly to our readers, and venture to affirm that few of them will be disappointed if they purchase it.

H. C.

Christ in the Pentateuch; or, Things Old and New concerning Jesus. By REV. H. BOURN, author of "Letters to the Working Classes on Important Subjects," etc. London: S. W. Partridge & Co.

THIS is another attempt to bring out the Christian signification of the Mosaic Ritual; or, in the author's words, "The desire of the writer has been that he might, under divine direction, lead his readers to discover more of the fulness which there is in the person and work of Jesus." The motive is excellent, and the labour consequent upon it is worthy of commendation. There are valuable things in the book, the perusal of which will minister to Christian strength and purity. There are ten chapters, and the book is well printed and handsomely got up.

An Earnest Expostulation. A Letter addressed to the Author of "High Church Claims of the Exclusive Brethren." London: Houlston & Wright.

MR. JOHN COX, junior, is worthy of all honour for the persevering zeal with which he vindicates the doctrinal soundness and high Christian character of Mr. B. W. Newton. The persecution to which this admirable man has been subjected through a long series of years, is something incredible. The persecuting spirit is lively as ever; it is only in the forms of its manifestation that the thing has changed. It is shocking to see men professing a very high standard of Christian excellence, dealing so wickedly as this pamphlet proves them to have done. We have nothing to do with the quarrels of "brethren," but to mourn over and earnestly deplore them. Mr. Cox's pamphlet tells a mournful story. We commend it to all whom it concerns.

Digitized by Google

Ho Erchomenos: an argument on the Pre-millennial Advent. By GEORGE GREENWELL. Wrexham: W. Bayley. (May be had of the Author, 83, Alt-street, Liverpool, for seven stamps.)

A POWERFUL pamphlet, whether regarded from a logical or theological point of view. We give it hearty commendation, and wish it large circulation.

Correspondence.

MR. JUKES.

SIR,—I wish you could find a corner for this note. "Baby in the cradle" may well suit some boys and girls (as a proper epithet), who by hubbub and squalling get their elders to act improperly towards persons who have studied God's word for years; but to apply that epithet to the persons themselves, who, for a lifetime of between forty and fifty years, have prayed and agonized over these matters is unworthy of Mr. Jukes. The "one true thought," which is "stronger than ten thousand pulpits," is this:—*There is no resurrection from the second death.* "*All the wicked he will (utterly) destroy.*" (Psa. cxlv. 20.)

Yours truly,
W. C. BOARDMAN.

MR. MAUDE AND THE CHRISTADELPHIANS.

DEAR SIR,—A friend having sent me a copy of your periodical, for the month of September, I perceive therein an article, signed "W. Maude," in which the writer commences a sketch of the various answers which he supposes are given by different classes to the question, "What is Man?" Amongst others, he deals with the Christadelphians, and their views on the subject, and incidentally describes their views on other matters, besides the one principally treated of. His remarks on this head contain misleading statements; I therefore crave your permission to put the doctrines of the Christadelphians in a correct light before those to whom Mr. Maude (inadvertently, it may be) has misrepresented them.

And, first, let me protest against the term by which he designates us. Christadelphians are not "Materialists." They believe in God, in Spirit, in angels, in Christ, in prayer, in resurrection, and in the connection between present action and destiny. Mr. Maude must be aware that Materialists, on the contrary, deny the existence of God, and disbelieve in anything not palpable to the senses, declaring resurrection impossible, and revelation a lie. If Mr. Maude was not aware of this, he ought not to have taken the liberty of applying the designation to us. If he was aware of it, it is not dealing fairly with his neighbours to designate them by a term calculated to create a false impression concerning them.

He represents the Christadelphian as "coolly asserting that a man's life, or spirit * * * is no part of himself." The Christadelphian asserts no such thing. Mr. Maude has mistaken a description of the state of facts, at the crisis of Adamic creation, for a definition of Christadelphian belief concerning the constitution of a living man. Such a mistake is certainly without excuse, because, in the book from which he quotes ("Twelve Lectures,") Christadelphian belief on the point is defined with such plainness and explicitness, that Mr. Maude could not have fallen into such a misconception except on one hypothesis, and that is, that he has not read the book which he condemns. I refer to such passages as the following: "They show him to be a COMPOUND—*a creature of living organisation*—a being created from the dust of the ground, vivified with life from God, and ennobled with qualities which constitute him the image of God, but nevertheless mortal in constitution." ("Twelve Lectures," fifth edition, page 38.) Again, "All our conscious as well as unconscious powers,

Digitized by Google

as living beings, are the result of a conjunction between the life-power of God and the substance of our organisations, and do not exist apart from that connection in which they are developed." (p. 39.) Christadelphians believe that man's life, or spirit, is as much a part of man's being as the life of any creature is a part of it while it lives; but that, in death, the spirit ceases to be or belong to man, and returns to its original proprietor.

Mr. Maude next declares that the theory of the Christadelphians is essentially atheistic. He alleges this as a necessary induction from the premises furnished by the creed of the Christadelphians. I will, therefore, with your permission, notice for a moment his definition of those premises, and correct the several misrepresentations which he falls into in the framing of it. His words are: "From no soul to no devil, and from no devil to no Holy Ghost, and from no Holy Ghost to no divinity of Christ, and from no divinity of Christ to no God, is but a series of steps, in the descent of which it is hard to stop; and it is an awful and alarming fact that, by those who fully accept Mr. Roberts's views, EVERY ONE OF THOSE STEPS HAS BEEN TAKEN SAVE THE LAST, *if we may except even that.*" Now, what is this, Mr. Editor, but a declaration that the Christadelphians do not believe in the existence of the Holy Spirit, or in the divinity of Christ? This declaration is utterly destitute of truth, and constitutes a slander upon the many intelligent men and women who, within the last few years, have accepted the doctrines of the Christadelphians as the only understanding of the Scriptures which harmonises it with itself, and with the truths laid bare by scientific research during the last fifty years. The Christadelphians believe in the Spirit and the Holy Spirit. They believe in the boundless diffusion of the former through all space, according to the statement of David, "Whither shall I go from thy spirit?" (Psa. cxxxix. 7.) They believe in the omnipotent power of that same Spirit when used as the instrument of the divine will. They do not believe in two spirits, but in one spirit in two phases; indeed, if it comes to that, the same Spirit can be exhibited in many aspects (see 1 Cor. xii. 4—11), where it is declared (as also in Eph. iv. 4), that there is but one Spirit, but a diversity of powers and administrations.

Christadelphians also believe in the divinity of Christ. They believe that he is the Son of God, in accordance with the words of the angel to Mary. (Luke i. 35.) That the Holy Spirit came upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadowed her, therefore the holy thing that was born of her was called the Son of God. They believe that the Holy Spirit descended upon him at his baptism, and filled him without measure, and that in this manner the Father dwelt in him, speaking words, and working works, which Jesus said were not his, but the Father's who sent him. (John xii. 49; xiv. 10.) They believe he was crucified; that he rose from the dead; that he was glorified and ascended to heaven, and that he is now sitting at the right hand of God. This is what is revealed concerning the Christ, and what is cordially believed by the Christadelphians. But an ordinary reader would imagine, from Mr. Maude's remarks, that they believed him to be a mere man, and not the manifestation of God in the flesh.

Even as regards the soul and the devil, Mr. Maude's remarks might be fairly challenged. To say, without qualification, that the Christadelphians neither believe in the soul or the devil is hardly fair. If Mr. Maude had said that they do not believe in the immortal soul of Grecian philosophy, nor in the existence of a superhuman personal devil, he would have been correct. The Christadelphians believe both in the soul and the devil, revealed in the Bible, but not in a deathless spark of divinity in the breast of mortal man, nor in a God of evil, with power almost equal to the Deity.

However, letting that pass, I proceed to refer to a more serious matter, namely, the conclusion imputed to the Christadelphians by Mr. Maude on the subject of God. With scarcely a qualification, he alleges that the question concerning God, "Is it he, or is it it"? "Has been answered by Mr. Roberts in a sense which denies the personal conscious existence of Jehovah." How Mr. Maude could pen such a sentence, on the supposition that he has read the lectures from which he professes to draw his conclusion, it is impossible to conceive. In

Digitized by Google

common justice, Mr. Editor, let me quote the following statement from the very first page of the lecture devoted to this subject: "The knowledge of God is the basis of divine sonship. * * * Where shall we find this knowledge? The answer is, in the Scriptures, in which God has been pleased to make himself known. We cannot get it anywhere else. Nature tells us something. The consummate wisdom of all her arrangements; the ineffable skill displayed in her handiwork; the unmistakable evidence of design abounding on every hand—all tell us that God IS; but they go no further than this. They tell us nothing of the nature of his being—nothing concerning the mode of his existence, the place of his abode, his character, his purposes, or his requirements of us. Nature is silent on these things; and where men have tried to penetrate the mystery without the aid of revelation, they have gone to speculative excess, and constructed systems of divinity which only reflect their own confused imaginations. We have an illustration of this in the philosophies of the ancients, and the heathen creeds of the present day. We cannot be too grateful to the unsearchable Almighty that, in his own spontaneous goodness, he has condescended to make a disclosure of himself, and has thus brought within our reach a knowledge more precious than rubies, even the knowledge which is unto life eternal." Again, read the following: "The Scriptures distinctly countenance, and indeed distinctly teach, the located existence of Deity. We submit the evidence. Paul says, in 1 Tim. vi. 16, *God dwells* IN LIGHT, *which no man can approach unto.*" Does not this amount to a localisation of the person of the Creator? * * * Of what explanation are these testimonies susceptible, if they do not mean that personal Deity—the Father, the Source of All—has local and *personal* development in a region here described as 'THE HEAVEN OF HEAVENS'? Consider the ascension of our Lord after his resurrection, and mark its tendency in the same direction. Where did he go to? Luke says (chap. xxiv. 51), 'He was parted from them, and carried up *into* HEAVEN;' and Mark reiterates the statement, 'He was received up INTO HEAVEN, and *sat on the right hand of God.*' (Mark xvi. 19.) To what conclusion can we come, but that the Deity has a personal manifested existence in dazzling light in the place called the 'THE HEAVENS'?"

These quotations, which are only a specimen of many similar statements, show the extent to which Mr. Maude has misrepresented the Christadelphians, in imputing to them a denial of the personal conscious existence of Jehovah.

On what ground, then, does Mr. Maude found his accusations? Merely on an inference which he deduces from words wrested by him from their meaning, and his misunderstanding of which shows, on the supposition that he is a man of common capacity, that he has not read the book which he has attempted to review. The author of "Twelve Lectures," has affirmed the teaching of Paul, that all things exist in God (Acts xvii. 28; Eph. iv. 6); that all things have been formed out of him (1 Cor. viii. 6); and are therefore but different forms of Eternal Power. This eternal power filling the universe, is biblically described as "Spirit." Scientific men have discovered a spirit in the universe which is everywhere present, and which constitutes the bases of all existence; and they have termed this "electricity." The aforesaid author argues that the Bible and nature, being necessarily in agreement, the "spirit" of the one is the "spirit" of the other. Surely, the spirit there is in the universe underlying all existence, is of God, seeing that all things are out of him, and that he maintains all by his power. Does it matter by what name we know this inscrutable element? Scientific men call it "electricity" from the substance—amber—in connection with which it was first accidentally discovered. The electricity of their discovery may not be the Spirit of God in its simplest form, but must needs contain it. Now, it is testified that God is Spirit. The author of "Twelve Lectures" does nothing more than repeat this testimony. But Mr. Maude instantly jumps to the conclusion that therefore God, in the said author's judgment, is no more than the passive incomprehensible fluid that the chemist generates in his electric jars. I repeat that he cannot have read the lectures thoroughly, or he never would have

Digitized by Google

come to such a conclusion. The Father dwells in light unapproachable. That he is Spirit in substance does not exclude the fact that there is Spirit irradiant filling all space. Nor does the all-prevalence of that irradiant Spirit exclude the fact of his dazzling personal existence on the throne of the universe. Power from him fills all, and by that power he is *en rapport* with all, filling heaven and earth. The very name of "Spirit" shows this. In all the classical languages, its derivation is from a word signifying, to blow, or breathe forth. The Spirit is therefore the principle of invisible power, breathed forth from the seat of Eternal Power, which is the Father dwelling in light, whom no man can approach. The Spirit breathed forth is the same in nature with its source, only that it exists in a state of diffusion instead of the intense glory existing in the Father's presence. Hence the proposition that the Spirit fills all, and that God, who created all, is Spirit, is only scriptural. Its concurrence with scientific discovery, so far as mortal discovery can rise in such a stupendous matter, ought to be a matter of joy with those who, like Mr. Maude, profess to believe in the Bible.

A further assumption of Mr. Maude's against the Christadelphians is equally without foundation, namely, that they deny the existence of the Spirit as such. They believe in one eternal Spirit, which alone is deathless; and that all creatures that live are but forms of it, whose existence and capacities are determined by the bounds set by the Great Spirit. They disbelieve in spiritual entities in earthly forms. They disbelieve in immortal souls in children of the dust, which Mr. Maude labours to prove. They disregard that "universality of belief" on the subject to which Mr. Maude attaches importance. They consider "universality of belief" universality of ignorance on any question of revelation, on which they consider the Bible the only teacher. And they have sufficient faith in God to believe that he can do anything. They see no necessity for "a persistent substance distinct from and underlying all changes of constitution and all degrees of consciousness," as the basis of personal identity; or as "the abiding thread which," says Mr. Maude, with a faithlessness which is amazing in one professing to believe in God, "being once snapped *can never be reunited.*" They have no sympathy with such "practical atheism." They believe the promises of God, and that what he has promised, he is able to perform (Rom. iv. 21), even to the restoration of abolished identity in the resurrection of men and women, who, however atomically different in substance, will be the identical persons who went through probation in this mortal state.

Did your rules allow, Mr. Editor, I should have been glad to have answered Mr. Maude's article on the general question; but as your permission restricts my letter to a correction of misrepresentations respecting the faith of the Christadelphians, I must rest contented with having said this much, and beg to conclude with thanks for your courtesy in allowing this permission, and with an expression of hope that you may be guided into all truth.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT ROBERTS,
Author of "Twelve Lectures."
Athæneum Rooms, Temple Row,
Birmingham.

THE SUEZ CANAL & ZECH. XIV.

SIR,—Whilst talking a short time since with a friend on "things hoped for," our conversation turned upon the Suez Canal, and it struck me as being very remarkable that the Emperor of the French, to whom many Christians look as the future Antichrist in embryo, should be the patron of a scheme for carrying the commerce of the world from the Mediterranean Sea to the Red Sea by water, as though he would—if the Antichrist—rob God of the glory of carrying out this great enterprise, as promised in Zech. xiv., when "the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst towards the east, and towards the west, and there shall be a very great valley . . . . and it shall be in that day that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem, half of them towards the former sea and half of them towards the hinder sea."

This idea was somewhat strengthened on reading in a daily paper that M. Lesseps, who is carrying out the Suez

Digitized by Google

Canal scheme, has now proposed to "make the wilderness a pool of water and the dry land springs of water," by cutting a large canal through the high land between the Sahara and the Mediterranean, the desert being some twenty-seven metres below the level of the water, and thus turning this waste into a vast inland sea.

It seems to my own mind strongly to corroborate the idea that Napoleon is the Antichrist of the future, especially when we remember that one of the distinguishing characteristics of Antichrist is his attempting to imitate God, and endeavouring to carry out those plans which God has set forth in his word that he himself will do; and we may look out as the time draws near for his (Antichrist's) appearance in his true character, for more decided marks by which the watching ones of God may know him, and still more daring usurpation of the power of God, by which he will so impress the world that they will the more readily worship him, when he shall exalt "himself above all that is called, or that is worshipped, so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

I am, dear sir,

Yours faithfully,

Trent. Chas. W. Pringle.

"THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS."

Dear Sir,—It is not my intention now, or perhaps ever, to reply at length to the letter of Mr. Jukes in your *Rainbow* for October. I would merely ask any of your readers, who may be influenced by it, to read my paper again in your September number, and to judge for themselves whether his observations are just or not.

I will merely remark that in one place (p. 467), Mr. Jukes in his endeavour to show that I have misinterpreted him, *quotes just half my sentence*, leaving the remaining half unquoted. If the entire sentence had been quoted, Mr. Jukes's point would have been lost. I can assure Mr. Jukes that I will never review his, or any other man's writings, in this way. The sentence to which I refer, is that at p. 403, "by thus quietly shutting out the doctrine, etc."

I am sorry I cannot accept Sydney Smith's advice, not to read a book before I review it. I read Mr. Jukes's work several times before I attempted to criticise it.

Yours faithfully,

Henry Constable.

CIRCULATION OF THE RAINBOW.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your appeal of last month, which I was sorry but not at all surprised to see, will you allow me two suggestions—one to your readers, the other to yourself.

A definite proposal sometimes produces more effect than a personal appeal for help. Mine is a very simple, a very easy, and if carried out, will be a very effective one. It is that each of your subscribers should take one more copy of the *Rainbow* than they do at present; and send their spare copies either to private friends, or to public men, who could easily be reached by the post, sending not more than two or three at the most to the same person. If this were done, even by those subscribers to whom an additional six or seven shillings a year is no very serious matter, it would probably secure the permanence of the Magazine.

The suggestion addressed to yourself is not susceptible of being put in such a definite form. But I am sure that the hint is worth throwing out. It is this: that the Preterist or Futurist view of the Apocalypse should be, as much as possible, an open question in the *Rainbow*. Not, of course, that you should withhold the expression of your own conviction; but that (1st) it should be distinctly understood, that in supporting the *Rainbow* no one is committed to either one view or the other: and (2nd) that persons who agree with you on the Pre-millennial Advent, and on Life in Christ, but differ very strongly with you on Futurism, should not be *quite* put out of court on that issue. You are not at all likely *now* to find a constituency of Futurists large enough to keep you afloat; and if not, then it will be necessary to make some concessions to the feelings of Preterists.

Speaking for myself, I can only say

Digitized by Google

that even if I were perfectly certain of what at present I regard only as probable, namely, that there is yet to be some further fulfilment of a large portion of the Apocalypse, it would not in the slightest degree shake my faith in its historical fulfilment. However defective may be any interpretation hitherto offered, whatever objections may lie against many of the details, that such a *combination* of apparent resemblances as are pointed out by many of the best historical interpreters, could be *accidental* and the setting of them be entirely due to the imagination of the inventors, would be to my mind a moral miracle, which I doubt whether all the Futurists in the world could inspire me with faith to believe. And though it would be grievously dishonest to endeavour to hold an untenable position, because it gives one an advantage against an enemy; yet, believing as I do, that perhaps the chief purpose of the Apocalypse was to guard us against the Papacy, by describing its rise, progress, and final doom, I deeply regret any attempt to wrest that mighty weapon out of our hands, by decrying altogether its historical application.

This, however, would not prevent me from supporting the *Rainbow*, in consideration of its noble protest against the traditional belief in Eternal Evil; but I am by no means so sure that it will not prevent others. I have myself been asked how I can recommend it, when it so decidedly opposes my own published views. The answer is easily made; but it may not be everyone that will make it. Nothing is perfect in this world; and we must use the best instrument that we can find. The object of these few remarks is to see if your Magazine could be brought a little *nearer* to perfection. Rely upon it, that you will strengthen your hands if you can soften down this difficulty a little.

Believe me, dear sir,
Yours faithfully,
SAMUEL MINTON.

ANTICHRIST.

DEAR SIR,—Allow me to offer a few remarks in reply to Mr. Skemp's Article of "Antichrist," in the number for August last. Mr. Skemp supposes that GREECE is to predominate above all the other empires in the development of Antichrist; and he grounds this opinion especially on TWO prophetic statements. First, Mr. Skemp refers to Zech. ix. 13, which he considers to be very striking; or, in other words, to be an argument almost decisive. Yet this passage in Zechariah has no visible connection with the subject of Antichrist at all; for in the very same verse Zechariah mentions Ephraim—"When I have filled the bow with Ephraim," and have raised up Zion against Greece, etc. But Ephraim is one of the ten tribes, and the ten tribes are not to return till AFTER the Advent, and not for some period of time afteriit. Consequently, the passage in Zecharah ix. cannot refer, by any means, to the time of Antichrist, but to the future subjugation of the nations after the Lord has taken possession of his throne —for that there will be wars at the first opening of the Millennium is evident from "the breaking in pieces," so often spoken of in Scripture—as well as from the remarkable sacrifices offered during the seven days of the Feast of Tabernacles. (Numb. xxix.) But in any case Ephraim can have no reference to Antichrist, because the ten tribes will not have returned during the time of Antichrist.

Secondly. The four empires in the second of Daniel are same as the four empires of the seventh of Daniel, and correspond to the "beast" in Rev. xiii. Now, in the second of Daniel, the BODY of the image represents the GREEK empire just as much as the BODY does in Rev. xiii.; yet, in the second of Daniel we find that the whole stress—the final event, the catastrophe—is thrown upon the fourth empire, on the FEET alone; and in regard to the FINAL event, the BODY, or Greek empire, is altogether passed over! But how does this agree with Mr. Skemp's theory in page 344? Certainly not at all.

The fact is this—as follows. A LEOPARD is an animal peculiarly distinguished by a body covered with dark SPOTS. Leave out the spots, and you leave out the leopard himself. There is no other mark whatever to distinguish the leopard; the spots are all in all to his individuality. But we all know that one or two spots will not make a leopard.

Digitized by Google

They would be imperceptible. In order to make a genuine and PERCEPTIBLE leopard, you must have a large surface covered with spots. And where would you find this large surface for the spots but in the BODY of the wild beast, in the thirteenth of Revelation? The head is occupied by the horns, the face by the lion, and the feet by the bear. Besides this, the head, or face, or feet, would not afford *room* enough for the leopardine spots. Therefore the BODY is selected as the representative of the GREEK kingdom, because Greece is the leopard; and there is no room left for the leopard except in the body or trunk. This is not a prophetic position, but simply one of convenience and necessity.

It would be simple, indeed, to ground any argument on the body being spotted like a leopard; but that the Personal Antichrist himself may spring from Greece, or a Greek family, is extremely probable, from Dan. viii.; and I am glad to observe that Mr. Skemp also admits this conclusion.

Believe me, dear sir,
Yours sincerely,
Torquay. R. A. PURDON.

LIFE IN CHRIST ONLY.

SIR,—It is now about ten years ago that I was led to search the Scriptures for myself in reference to the future destiny of the wicked. I had never for a moment called in question the generally received opinion that every human being was born immortal, and that the unregenerate world would exist in a state of endless suffering; until one day, desiring to find a text which should express the alternative of everlasting happiness or everlasting misery, I commenced the search, but, to my great astonishment, no such passage could be found. Again and again there was presented the alternative of life or death, but never that of endless bliss or endless woe.

I then set myself to enquire, When was this doctrine of never-ending torment, as the wages of sin, *first* revealed by God to his creature man? Was it prior to the fall, or immediately after the fall? Did our first parents know anything of it? Did Noah preach it? Was Moses, David, or any of the prophets commanded to make it known? No; it certainly was not taught in the Old Testament. "The soul that sinneth it shall *die*," was reiterated again and again, but not a word about endless misery. To the New Testament I then turned, and read it carefully through, praying earnestly that I might discover the truth; but here I could not find a distinct, emphatic statement that the wages of sin is everlasting suffering. In reference to Matt. xxv. 46—the passage chiefly relied on—it is there clearly implied that the wicked will *not* live for ever; life eternal belongs only to the righteous. The "everlasting punishment" is doubtless the same as that mentioned in 2 Thess. i. 9, "punished with everlasting destruction." The punishment is everlasting in its *effects;* in like manner the judgment is said to be "everlasting," because everlasting in its consequences.

Again, I searched my Bible for the doctrine of the soul's natural immortality, but not a hint of it could I discover. I found Scripture often speaking of the soul dying, perishing, being lost, killed, destroyed, cut off, but never using such expressions as "man's immortal soul," "never-dying soul," etc. Christians are said to "*seek* for immortality" (Rom. ii. 7), and therefore it cannot be an inherent and essential property of the soul. "If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever" (John vi. 51), is one of a multitude of texts which clearly prove that every one will *not* live for ever. Life in Christ, and only in Christ, is the sum and substance of all Scripture; "this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son."

Never can I be sufficiently thankful that I was thus led to search the Scriptures for myself on this great subject. The dark prospect of an eternity of sin and misery, under the dominion of Satan, is now exchanged for the bright and blessed hope of Christ's glorious triumph over the devil and all his works.

I am, sir, yours respectfully,
AMICUS.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

DECEMBER 1, 1869.

REST IN CHRIST.

LEAVING entirely out of view for the moment all denominational peculiarities, and the different conclusions to which men have come respecting the future of the church and the world, it is refreshing to think of the glorious centre of all divine life and hope—the Lord Jesus Christ. In him there is rest for the weary heart amidst the trials of the world, and the storms that agitate, and rend, and are likely at no distant day to overwhelm the nominal church. Happy is the man who has personal knowledge of this most blessed rest. He may be sorely tried in any or many of the manifold forms in which trials come; and,—keenest pang of all!—his loyalty to the Lord he loves, may be doubted, simply because that very loyalty has compelled him to reject as spurious certain notions that pass current in the churches as verities of divine revelation; but his refuge is certain, his place of shelter from the storm is sure, he comforts himself in the Lord, and leaves his cause with his God.

And with relation to the great future, there is rest in Christ. Complicated, intervolved, mysterious as all things seem to be, the infinite wisdom of our blessed Redeemer will arrange and settle every thing so as to call forth the wonder and praise of the intelligent universe. All will yet be pronounced very good by One who cannot err, and the concurrent testimony of men and angels will echo the glorious declaration. It cannot, it will not be otherwise; let us therefore calmly, quietly, lovingly, REST IN CHRIST.

Digitized by Google

THE PROPHETIC HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

II. ISRAEL IN THE PRESENT DISPENSATION.

THE first and most melancholy fact connected with the dispersion of Israel is the sin which occasioned it, the awful national crime of rejecting and crucifying their Messiah, which, after they had quenched the Holy Ghost given on Pentecost, entered into the body of the nation, and with the explosive force of an earthquake, rent them into fragments and scattered them to the winds of heaven. The crime was, indeed, great and terrible—the greatest and most terrible ever committed; and the punishment of eighteen hundred years has been in proportion. There was the evidence of noblest patriotism, which generally wins the hearts of men; there was the evidence of immaculate purity and holy love, which the vilest of men often respect though they do not imitate it; there was the evidence of their own Scriptures, telling them the nature and character of the Messiah, the place of his birth, the mode of his death, the time of his resurrection, the expiation of sin in his blood, the ascension into heaven, the calling of the Gentiles, and almost everything, however minute, that concerned him. The prophecies are exact, circumstantial, and clear. There was the evidence of miracles, a kind of evidence which the Jews specially sought, and which, acting immediately on the senses, seems irresistible; there was the glorious effusion of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost in their own capital city, and manifested through members of their own community; and finally, there was the evidence of the suffering martyr-church pleading with them in the name of God, and by the power of the Holy Ghost, to come to the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation. All this evidence they resisted; scornfully, blasphemously, perseveringly, murderously resisted, until the Long-Sufferer would suffer no longer, and the day of their national destruction came over them, black and cloudy, with storm, and earthquakes, and thunder.

(2.) Let us meditate a moment on that awful day. Stand with me on the Mount of Olives, and with the eyes of the body and the eyes of the understanding open, mark a few of the events that are passing before us. The nation in the midst of which we stand is the Hebrew—the oldest, the noblest, on the earth, but now corrupt and ready to perish; the city before us is Jerusalem, the residence of the great King whose temple is still there, and whose presence formerly filled it with majesty and glory. That city and temple shall in a few months be burned up with fire, and the whole nation slain, or enslaved, or scattered. But who are these that approach us on the north side of the city? A people of fierce countenance,

Digitized by Google

coming from afar, rapid in their movements, and voracious as the eagles, an iron metallic people stamping into dust the residue of nations; they are approaching sixty thousand strong, and at their head is the best general of the empire, called from the far-distant Britain to guide the Roman eagles to the carcase, which is Jerusalem and the Jewish nation. (Matt. xxiv. 28.) The period of the Jewish polity is hastening to a close, the iniquity of the nation is nearly full, the time is come and the Man, and vengeance is to be poured out upon them to the uttermost. Yet the struggle was long and terrible. Many an army was repulsed, and often did Jewish despair conquer the steadiness of Roman discipline. It was no regular war, but a series of butcheries, by means of which all the cities and villages were destroyed; and more than a million of men perished by the sword! Even the fall of Jerusalem, after the long and bloody warfare of three years, did not end the slaughter. No! the maddened nation, always valiant but now in the agonies of despair, fights and continues to fight, rebels and continues to rebel, defies and continues to defy the conquerors for many years and through several reigns, until finally they are, by the Imperial decree, altogether banished from the country and the holy city.

(3.) And now mark how the hand of God was, in all these national commotions, fulfilling his prophetic word and bringing his purposes to pass. On this Mount of Olives, where we stand, the blessed Jesus stood when he foretold all these desolations. Read Luke xix. 41—48, Matt. xxiv. and Mark xiii., and you will find all the conspicuous events of the war and the ruin of the city clearly foretold. Take the following us a specimen of the minuteness and clearness of the prophecy:—the city shall be sacked and taken, your temple burned to the ground, wars and rumours of wars shall overwhelm the nation, the believers shall be hated and persecuted, false Christs shall rise and deceive many, the Roman eagles shall gather round Jerusalem to devour it, the abomination of desolation shall stand in the holy place, there shall be false prophets deceiving many, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles till the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled. Now, you are aware that all these predictions did actually come to pass, so that here again we have an irrefragable proof of the truth of our holy religion. The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. The devouring eagles confirm the divine prediction; and when Titus digged his trenches round Jerusalem he was, though a heathen, arguing for the truth of Christianity! Thus we see how wondrously the divine prescience weaves together into unity the tangled threads of our distracted world! Nero in Rome, Vespasian in Britain, the sects of the Jews, the passions of the multitudes, the bloody feuds within the walls of the city, pale famine, black death, that delicate woman (Deut. xxviii. 56) Mary, killing, cooking, and eating her own child—all these, and thousands of

Digitized by Google

other events, greater and smaller than these, with millions of effects, causes and relations. extending indefinitely both in time and space, must work together in bringing about the accomplishment of the prophecy of Christ. And Moses, too, foretold all this more than fourteen hundred years before it came to pass! Read Deut. xxviii., and leave Bunsen and Colenso to their doubts and their difficulties. Could Dr. Colenso tell me who shall be his successor after fourteen hundred years? or what kind of a siege the Cape-town shall suffer at that distant period? Moses was inspired; prophecy proves it, history confirms it, the New Testament asserts it, the church believes it, and the present condition of the Jews is a standing monument of it.

(4.) But now when the nation is reduced to extremity, sold into slavery in thousands, banished from their country and forbidden to return, a new series of prophetic wonders begins to evolve the divine purpose of Providence before the nations. They are to be reduced to extremity, for the prophecy says so (Lev. xxvi. 21—39), but they cannot perish; his purpose holds them fast in all their despair and desolation (Lev. xxvi. 44; Jer. xlvi. 28); and though few in number, and mixed (mechanically) with the nations, they cannot blend or be incorporated with them. Why do they not run together and localise themselves nationally in some one place? The earth is large enough, and there are plenty of unoccupied territories, but the hand of God is upon them and they cannot! Why must you hear their voices, and see their Abrahamic faces, in all countries and nations? The decree of the Mighty One has scattered them into all lands, contrary to all expectation and experience; and while reason admits the fact, it seeks in vain for the explanation. But surely, being pulverised into mere units, and thus scattered, they must speedily disappear among the surging and victorious nations? No; they must not disappear, but maintain their separate existence, contrary to nature, experience, and universal history. The Angles, the Danes, the Saxons, the Normans, and many other nations, have all become blended into that great *unity* which we call the British Nation; but the few thousand Jews remain untouched in the midst of the all-dissolving alembic. It is so with Germany, France, Spain, Italy, and the other nations. There is a fusing, coalescing power always at work, different it may be in different countries, bringing all accessions from without to the national type; and, with the exception of the Jews, it has always succeeded. Napoleon thought he could extinguish the varieties of colour in St. Domingo by compelling every Frenchman to marry two wives, a black one and a white one; but even he never imagined he could extinguish the peculiarities of his Jewish subjects! And this great fact, now well-known as the single exception to the principle of national progress and development, is distinctly and frequently foretold in the Holy Scriptures. (Lev.

Digitized by Google

xvi. 44; Deut. xxviii.; Jer. xv. 4, xxix. 18, xlvi. 28; Amos ix. 8.) Here, again, is a file on which infidelity may try its teeth. Could any mere human foresight have given these prophecies? No man of sound mind can think so. Human power could as easily create the sun, moon, and stars, as human sagacity foretell such events at the distance of ages!

II. But, while without doubt we resolve the dispersion and preservation into the supreme and absolute will of God, we may be able to trace some of the *means* that have contributed to that end.

(1.) The Jews have the strongest, the clearest, the noblest, of all nationalities. They have one father, the father of the faithful; they have a great, and wonderful, and long-continued history, which is glorified by prophets, patriots, and heroes; by angels, by visions, and revelations; by one great all-comprehending truth, the divine unity; and by a long series of prodigies and miracles.

(2.) This naturally fills the unrenewed heart with pride, and tends to perpetuate hatred and defiance. Ye Gentiles are but of yesterday, we are the ancient people; ye are imitators, we are the originals; ye are the borrowers, we are the lenders; your religion, your civilisation, your Scriptures, your psalmody, your Messiah, are all from us; why should we give up our nationality and be incorporated with the Gentiles?

(3.) Then, again, their persecutions keep them separate; for persecution, to answer its purpose, must be complete and perfect, so that the whole community must be unsparingly slaughtered; and then, indeed, as in Spain, the heresy may be eradicated; but in large communities this is not easily done. It is no easy matter to kill seven millions of men, and except it could be accomplished at *once*, human nature, fallen as it is, would rebel against the slaughter. The Jews indeed have suffered more, a thousand times more, than any other nation; but the most terrible and murderous persecutions come far short of eradication or annihilation; thousands die but millions remain, and these condole with one another, help one another, weep with one another, salute one another in the sacred language, and in the midst of their afflictions turn their eyes and their hearts towards Jerusalem. This brotherly national sympathy, increased and cemented by suffering, intensifies their hatred of their common enemies and keeps them a separate people.

(4.) Then, again, there is in them the ineradicable conviction of future greatness, based on very many Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, and in complete harmony with God's moral administration of the world. The Rationalists among them may deny the existence of any such conviction, and in many of the less educated Jews it may lie as an undeveloped germ; but in the nation, as a whole, it exists strongly, nor can the most free-thinking among them shake it entirely off. Jerusalem is still to

Digitized by Google

be the city of the Great King, and the scattered nation is in some mysterious way to be connected with the benediction and blessedness of the whole world.

(5.) Be it remembered, also, that the Jews are the mortal enemies of idolatry of every kind, so much so indeed, that even in opposition to the opinions of the ancient Rabbis, they consider the worship of the Holy Trinity as a species of idolatry. The modern Jews are, like the Moslems, strict Unitarians. It is a very strange and unaccountable fact, that before the Babylonish captivity, neither the threatenings of the law nor the warnings of the prophets, nor the direct and immediate punishments from God himself, could keep them from idolatry; and since that they never have, in all their eventful history, shown the least tendency to the worship of idols. Now, all the heathen nations are full of the most abominable idolatries; the Roman Catholic nations are full of pictures and images, saint-worship and angel-worship, and above all the worship of the Virgin Mary. The Protestant nations and churches are indeed better than the other Gentiles, but still they are Trinitarians, and deny the divine unity of the Jewish Jehovah, as the Jews understand that. They, too, are idolaters and violate the *Shema*, the very rallying-cry of the whole scattered nation. (Deut. vi. 4.) This stern and exaggerated monotheism serves to preserve them from incorporation with the Gentile nations.

III. But these principles and feelings, though they may partially account for the Jews remaining separate though scattered among the nations, give no answer to the question, Why are they scattered? or, Why do they remain scattered? Have they lost the social and brotherly feelings of the nation? Not so; they are of all nations the most national, and social, and sympathetic. Why, then, do they not congregate in one locality, and re-institute their ancient political and religious polity? The Americans who tolerate the Mormons, would certainly tolerate and protect the reunited Jewish people. Or why do they not appoint a day, and start off at once for Palestine and the Holy City? We think we see the approaching circle on the edge of the horizon, nearing and diminishing until it closes around the boundaries of their ancient inheritance. The sight of seven millions would clear the land at once of its oppressors and plunderers, their tread would shake the throne of Constantinople, and their shouts of joy and thanksgiving would recall the glories of the year of Jubilee. Why do they not take possession? Who is there to hinder them? The Turks could not, and the Christian nations would not. There is no hindrance but the decree of God. The ancient curse is not yet exhausted, and the terrible crime still separates and unmans them! How awful is sin! How tenacious the curse that cleaves to it! What wonderful virtue there must be in the blood of Christ, and what love in shedding it, when its rejection

Digitized by Google

entails such evils! How unsearchable are the judgments of God, and his ways are indeed past finding out! To know more of him, and to love him more, should be our fervent desire and prayer; for certain it is, the more we know of him, the better we shall love him.

IV. But as we cannot suppose that God, out of mere vengeance scattered his ancient people and still keeps them scattered, it is natural to ask: "What is his purpose in so doing?" What does he teach us by the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews?

(1.) He teaches us, in the first place, that his council shall stand and he will do all his pleasure. Titus wished to save the Holy Temple, but he could not; Julian, the apostate, wished to rebuild it, but he could not. All nations would wish, as the Egyptians did of old, to get rid of them, but they cannot; and one Roman emperor did all that law and imperial favour could do to bring them back to Jerusalem, but he could not; the Jews wish above all things to return, but they cannot; they hate the nations they reside among, yet they cannot leave them. The time is not come, and the divine purpose marks out its course by means, without means, or in opposition to means. Learn, then, this lesson not to resist God! You cannot do it successfully, and this lesson Jerusalem teaches.

(2.) The destruction of Jerusalem was useful to the Christian church by annihilating the ancient ritualism and breaking their traditional fetters. While the temple stood it was still the holy place, the place where men ought to worship, and the Christians attended its services. They offered the sacrifices, they joined in the national worship, they kept the Sabbath, they contended for circumcision, they were zealous for the law (Acts xxi. 20); and Christianity and Judaism were likely to be blended together in the natural developments of the church. Such aspirations were at once extinguished by the fire of the temple, which Titus could not extinguish, and by one terrible blow the providence of God emancipated the infant church from bondage, and prepared her for full and free development.

(3.) We are never to forget, and the Jews especially should remember that the destruction of their city and the dispersion of the nation, was the direct punishment of God for the sin of the nation in crucifying the Son and quenching the Spirit of God. This terrible act of judgment fulfilled many of the prophecies both of Moses and of Christ, pulverised and scattered the most compact national unity in the world, demonstrated the true Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth, and manifested to Israel, and to all nations, the vileness and malignity of sin. Press this home upon the Jews: *Why are you not in Palestine?* What sin were you guilty of which issued in such a captivity? Idolatry is the greatest sin of the Old Testament, but even idolatry had only been visited by the captivity of seventy years in Babylon. What led then to your present dispersion? Answer, *if*

Digitized by Google

you can. You were not idolaters. Answer, I say; you cannot, but I can. You "killed the Prince of Life"—you crucified the Son of God; and the fearful cry of your fathers (Matt. xxvii. 25) follows you like the shadow of death, and drives you irresistibly into the grave of the nations. (Ezek. xxxvii. 12, 13.) *This* is the cause of your dispersion, this is the origin of your national calamities; and until you see and acknowledge this, you can never receive the favour and blessing of the Lord. The rejection of the Messiah has been your national ruin, and your reception of him shall be your national restoration and glory. This is the doctrine both of common sense and the Bible. (Rom. xi. 15.)

(4.) We see in their rejection another purpose of God's grace, which is the calling and perfecting of the Gentile Church. This is dimly adumbrated in Deut. xxxii. 21, and clearly enunciated by Paul in the eleventh chapter of the Romans, in which, among other things, we are taught that Israel, though rejected and broken off for a time, is by no means cast away; that this rejection is only partial, as only some of the branches are broken off, and this partial breaking off and this partial blindness, are to continue only till the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, and then all Israel shall be saved by the coming of the Deliverer to Zion; that they were broken off that the Gentiles might be grafted into the Jewish Olive Tree, which is the root and stem, as the Gentiles are the branches, and that as the Jews fell through unbelief, so we can stand only by faith. Hence we learn that they are in deep error who hold that the Jews are so cursed, and so rejected, that they are never more to come into the favour of God; for, says Paul, there is still an election among them which the gospel is to reach, and which preachers and missionaries are to gather into the fold. Only some of the branches are broken off, and not total blindness but blindness in part, has happened to Israel; and even that shall be removed when her Deliverer shall come and turn away ungodliness from Jacob. We see here, indeed, the general purpose of the gospel dispensation, which is not and never has been national, but individual and elective. The Epistles are not addressed to the Romans, the Galatians, the Corinthians, etc., but to a small community of believers in each of these cities, and even so would the apostle write at the present time. He would not write to the Londoners, the Romans, and the Parisians, but to "the saints," to "the faithful," to "the beloved of God" in these cities. The preaching of the word, from Pentecost to the present time, has "taken out" only an election, nor does it seem to be the purpose of God during this dispensation to draw mankind, nationally and universally, into the covenant of grace. The wheat and the tares grow together till the harvest, and the wise and the foolish virgins are in the same encampment when the coming of the Bridegroom awakens them. Election seems to be the principle of the dispensation;

Digitized by Google

universality comes with the conversion of Israel and the coming of the Deliverer to Zion.

(5.) By scattering the children of Israel, and keeping them scattered, the Lord is holding up to the eyes of all men the reality of his judgments, and the verity of his threatenings. The exiles from their own country are the monitors of a new Jerusalem and a heavenly country; they who are themselves the firmest of unbelievers are the strongest witnesses of the Christian religion. Wherever you see the pale Abrahamic face, you have a proof of the Messiahship of him who gave the prophecies from Mount Olivet. (Matt. xxiv.) These seven millions of olive trees, scattered through the world, blasted by lightning, and rent by the thunderbolt, lift up their scathed branches to testify to all nations that the prophecy of the Saviour is fulfilled; that sin is the ruin of any people, and that God is the Lord and will be obeyed! Or call them seven millions of granite pillars, cold, and hard, and bare, on which the angel of death has written the wrath of God in flames of fire. All the materials for building are there, but they can have no temple; all the elements of nationality are there, but they cannot form a nation; they are seven millions of men, and they can only sit and weep by their ruined walls, when a few days of Maccabean patriotism and valour would drive the Turk out of Syria, and re-conquer their long-lost inheritance. They were the people of the blessing, and shall be so again, but they are the people of the curse, and as such they teach us many important lessons.

V. As to their material, moral, and religious condition, take the following brief statement, which though very imperfect is correct so far as it goes. The Jews in Germany have something of the following character. There are a few of them very rich, extremely rich, but the great majority are comparatively poor, but still they have enough for an actual subsistence. There are no beggars amongst the Jews; they assist one another in a very noble and brotherly manner, and the poorest have some way of earning a livelihood. The Jews are trained to habits of industry from their infancy, and taught to depend on their own exertions. They marry young, and consequently have large families, preserving and perpetuating among them the old patriarchal love of children. This I consider to be a strong proof of national and personal morality. I have never known a really bad man who was fond of children. We owe the murder of infants and the decrease of population, as in France and elsewhere, to the detestable materialism of an over-refined civilisation. As to the general morality of the Jews, I have no reason to believe it inferior to that of Christians. If we are to judge of moral conduct by the absence of crimes, the sanctification of the Sabbath, the attendance to household duties, the attachment to religious principles, I think the Jews do not come behind their neighbours.

Digitized by Google

It is true their position as strangers and intruders among the nations, necessarily surrounds them, in some measure, with suspicion and distrust; and you may occasionally hear them spoken of as sharpers, vampires, and blood-suckers; but such language should not be taken literally, for it often proceeds from personal hatred and national bitterness. There are, no doubt, rogues and villains among them as among the other nations; and it is even natural from their position, that the proportion should be greater than among settled communities, but on the whole they are a moral, quiet, industrious, law-respecting people.

As to literature, the German Jews stand high, and in favourable circumstances show themselves pre-eminent. Few names stand higher in the temple of literary fame than Spinoza, Mendelssohn, Lessing, and the last of the church Fathers, Dr. Augustus Neander; and many others might be added to the list. Those who have become incorporated with the Christian church have generally attained a high position among their brethren. The law is not open to unconverted Jews, but medicine, literature, the press, and the parliament are; and some of the most renowned physicians, some of the most subtle debaters in parliament, and very many of the leaders of the daily and weekly papers are Jews. There are no Tories amongst the Jews. It is remarkable that the most conservative people on the face of the earth, should be at the head of the party of political progress in all parts of the world. Their position as a scattered, persecuted people, leads them to liberal opinions; but when they had the power they were, and when they have power they are, stern and unscrupulous persecutors. Where they exist in large communities, like Amsterdam, their fanaticism, seething and boiling as in a cauldron, reminds you that they belong not only to the most persecuted, but also to the most persecuting, nation in the world. Equal rights and privileges the Jews, as a nation, can never enjoy; they must either be sovereign or subject, the first of nations in dignity and glory, or the last of all nations in degradation and distress. When they were obedient, they were the first and most honoured of all; in their disobedience and unbelief, they are the most despised and persecuted of nations; when they shall turn to the Lord, they shall again attain to "the first dominion" and the most honourable place among the nations. Mediocrity, equality, is no characteristic of the Jews. Extremes of all kinds meet in the scattered nation, and in all their history they are monuments of the blessing or the curse.

The Jews are, like other nations, divided on the most important subjects of religion and revelation; and their fierce fervour of former fanaticism seems yielding to the influence of time, of luxury, of disappointed hopes, of Gentile kindness, of literature, and of legal rights. The sun is accomplishing what the storm could not. One great body of the Jews have

Digitized by Google

abandoned utterly the faith of their fathers, and even the hope of a Messiah or a national restoration. They are, in fact, Deists who, like the old philosophers of Greece and Rome, hold all religions as equally false, equally useful in private life, and equally necessary for the guidance and government of the nations. These men are the wealthy, the worldly, the political Jews—the lineal successors of the old Sadducees, denying angels and spirits, and seeking no redemption, either by Moses from Egyptian bondage, or by Christ from the dominion of sin and death.

> Eat, drink, and die, what can the rest avail us?
> So said the royal sage Sardinapalus.

The history of modern rationalism is very curious, and may be stated in a sentence or two. It took its rise in England, as almost all that is good and all that is bad in Europe has done. Our Deists of the eighteenth century began it, and of all unbelievers they were the clearest, the subtlest, and the most moral. This leaven of iniquity, passing from Toland to Tindal, Chubb and Herbert, Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke, Blount, Collins, and others, into the more mercurial people of old France, brought forth in the literary and aristocratic classes the daring infidelity of the French revolution. Then, having overturned all things in that country, and filled the land with blood, and death, and victory, it entered Germany with the soldiers of the revolution, and wrought its way for a time among the thoughtful communities of the Teutonic race. By the war of liberation and the battle of Leipsic, it was checked and beaten back in some degree; until liberty, and luxury, and worldliness gaining head among the liberated nations, it rooted itself deeply in the genial soil of German philosophism and university education. Then came the reign of death in the German churches and of tyranny in the German governments; then came forth from the press and the pulpit those fanciful views of Scripture, those doubtful and dangerous queries and insinuations which, issuing in infidelity, spread over the land like lava from a volcano, turning all that was fresh, and beautiful, and glorious, into the stillness and desolation of spiritual death. This tide of rationalism rolled on, deepening and broadening till the year '48 opened the eyes of the upper and educated classes, by presenting all around them the surging masses of a fierce democracy leavened with their own principles, and ready to put them in practice. Then the princes, and proprietors, and all the aristocrats saw their error and changed their tactics. They said to themselves, "We have been teaching infidelity, and thereby relaxing the principles of rule and obedience, of respect and authority among men. If God and Christ, and the word of God, and the ordinance of the church, are not reverenced, it is not likely that our thrones, and principalities, and powers, will be much respected. He who disbelieves

Digitized by Google

God will not believe the king; we must therefore return to the principles of obedience and order, which are the principles of the Holy Scripture, and which alone are able to control the passions of the multitude, and secure to monarchs the possession of their thrones." Since '48 then, the upper classes have generally been turning to the gospel, the universities have been re-asserting the doctrines of revelation, and many earnest pastors are fighting the battles of the faith. Of course there are many exceptions everywhere, but the progress of evangelical feeling and religion during the last twenty years has been immense in that country.

The tide seems now on the turn again, and many things indicate another period of coldness and unbelief. The *facts* of the gospel are denied—not doctrines merely and principle, but the historical facts on which its foundations rest—such as the death, the resurrection, and the ascension of Christ. This is the new phase which the Proteus is assuming, and hence the spirituality of God, the act of creation, the responsibility of man, and the hopes of future glory, are all denied; and men, arising from the brutal form and nature, shall perish like the brutes. This is the blessed hope set before us in the gospel of rationalism! And now this gospel of the Devil, which arose in England, after making a circuit of the European nations, is returning to its native home; but not as of old to float in the circles of a few noble lords and philosophers, but to make its home in the church, the schools, and the universities. This is indeed a sign of the times. The three leavens which brought the Jewish church to ruin, are coming into fierce activity all over the world. The leaven of Herod, which is tyranny; the leaven of the Sadducees, which is infidelity; and the leaven of the Pharisee, which is superstition; are mustering their hosts for the battle of Armageddon: and well might our hearts fail us if we were not waiting for the King, and the kingdom of righteousness and peace.

The Jews are divided into two hostile camps, the Orthodox and the Rationalists; the former believing Moses and the Thalmud, and the other rejecting both. Thus the Papacy, the Protestant churches, and the Jewish synagogue, are all divided and distracted by this modern Mephistophiles.

VI. It is hard to say which of these parties is the more hostile to Christianity; but yet we can truly affirm that nine-tenths of the baptised thousands are from among the Rationalists, while perhaps the majority of the really earnest Christianised Jews are from the Orthodox. Worldly interests, marriage, and many other circumstances, lead many of the Rationalists to submit to the rite of baptism, but it is merely a form, and in heart and feeling they remain as they were; yet the parish minister, and not the Rabbi, becomes their pastor, their children are incorporated in the visible church; and though we can only hope they are won to the Saviour, they are certainly lost to Judaism. If, as a missionary, you call

Digitized by Google

on these men, they have their answer always ready—that they belong to the Established Church, and are quite satisfied with the instructions of their own pastors. In this way they shut the door against missionary labours among them as effectually as do the stern fanatical Thalmudists. Of course these political converts never connect themselves with any but unbelieving Rationalistic churches and ministers. This also accounts for the fact, that few Jews are baptised by the missionaries and many by the parish ministers. The missionary stands alone; he is a foreigner generally, he has no commanding influence or authority in the land, he can offer little protection and no support to the converts. It is quite different with popular parish ministers, and rich and respectable congregations; and it is with these the converts in general connect themselves. There is an absorbing power in masses and multitudes, which draws the atoms and individuals into the vortex. Even when the missionaries have been the instruments of their conversion, the converts mostly attach themselves to the Established Church. It is a fixture, it is royal, it is an institution of the country, it is the most respectable institution in the nation, and can therefore offer them the safest home and the surest protection. And here the question naturally arises, "Are not the Jews likely, in the end, to be absorbed in the baptised multitudes?" It is a very serious question, and if I had not the history of the past and the prophecies of the future to guide me, I would say, "Yes, in all probability the scattered nation will in the end yield to surrounding influences, and vanish from the face of the earth." But no, it cannot be; for, in the first place, the few thousands of converts leave millions behind them, and it is only in European nations that Rationalists, whether Jews or Gentiles, have any existence. In the boundless regions of the East they are unknown. Doubt does not exist in the regions of the sun. There is not sufficient mental activity among the Orientals to enable them to doubt or disbelieve. The Christians, the Jews, and the Moslems are all believers. The indifference which leads not a few Jews here to abandon the Jewish community does not exist there, so that the loss which the Jewish nation sustains, on the whole, is after all, very inconsiderable. Then, secondly, we have the sure word of God for the perpetuity of God's covenant with Abraham and his seed (Gen. xiii. 15), which personally was never fulfilled to Abraham (Acts vii.), and which has been suspended for a time to his seed because of their unbelief, but surely shall be fulfilled to both according to the word of the Lord himself, and the statement of Stephen in the seventh of Acts. Indeed, the restoration, conversion, and supremacy of Israel among the nations, occupy such a conspicuous place in the Holy Scriptures, that we cannot deny the perpetuity of the nation without rejecting the inspiration of the Bible and perverting all the ordinary principles of the interpretation of language. He who by

Digitized by Google

means of this mystical spiritualism can weed out the hopes of Israel from the word of God, is an unbeliever of a great portion of Holy Scripture. He is like Colenso, but less openly and honourably than Colenso, reducing the Old Testament Scriptures to a mythology, in which neither history nor prophecy can be depended on as the grounds of our faith and hope. Read a few passages on this solemn subject, and let the mind be at rest as to the future of the scattered nation:—Deut. xxx. 1—10; Isai. ii. 1—5; iv. 2—6; xi. 10—16; xviii. 7; xxxiii. 20—24; xxxv. 10; xlix. 18—23; lx. 15—22; lxii. 10—12; lxv. 17—25; lxvi. 19—24.

THE RETURN OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST AND THE HOPE OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

"For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry."—Hebrews x. 35—37.

WHILE the wonder-stricken apostles were looking stedfastly toward heaven after their ascending Lord, two celestial messengers stood by them in white apparel, and addressed them in the following terms: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts i. 11.) Henceforth the return of Jesus to this earth became the burden of the apostles' doctrine, and the hope and expectation of the early believers.

Judging from the purport of the bulk of the theological treatises and pulpit discourses of the present day, one would hardly expect that in the New Testament epistles, and the Revelation of John, the Second Coming is mentioned or alluded to not fewer than sixty-eight times. Yet such is the case.

It is not, however, from the frequency of reference, simply, to this grand event that its importance in the estimation of the apostles and the early believers appears, but also by the earnest and glowing language in which it is invariably mentioned. Thus, Paul in his letter to the saints at Rome, indicates the intense desire of himself, and of those to whom he was writing, in the following stirring and graphic language: "I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are not worth to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us; for the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the sons of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they but ourselves also, WHO HAVE THE FIRST FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT, even *we* groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption—to wit, the redemption of our bodies." (Rom. viii. 18—23.) The same writer commences his letter to the church at Corinth by expressing his thankfulness to God on

Digitized by Google

their account, because they came "behind in no gift, *waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*," who, says he, "shall confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. i. 7, 8.)

It is to the same event the apostle refers in his letter to the faithful in Christ Jesus residing at Ephesus, when he speaks of "the day of redemption," "the redemption of the purchased possession." (Eph. i. 14 : iv. 30.)

Writing to the Philippians, he thus expresses his hope and theirs : "Our conversation is in heaven, whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. iii. 20, 21.)

In exhorting the brethren at Colosse to "mortify" the desires of the flesh, he employs this motive : "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." (Col. iii. 3—5.)

Referring, in his first letter to the Thessalonians, to the result of his preaching among them, he congratulates them that it was such as to lead them to "turn from dumb idols to serve the living God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come." (1 Thess. i. 9, 10.) And the object of his earnest prayer that "the Lord would make them to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men," was "to the end that he might stablish their hearts in holiness before God even the Father, at *the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints*." (Chap. iii. 12, 13.) And when, in the same letter, he administers consolation concerning those who had fallen asleep, the same event—the return of the Lord, and its concomitant results—are the burden of his theme. "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning those who are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others that have no hope; for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so those also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent [that is go before] those who are asleep; for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. iv. 14—17.) To this gathering together of the resurrected and transformed saints to the Lord Jesus, Paul also refers in the fifteenth chapter of his first letter to the Corinthians, in these sublime and soul-stirring utterances : "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we [that is, we who are alive] shall be changed. . . . . Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory."

The second letter to the Thessalonians opens with words of encouragement to believers under the severe tribulation they were called on to suffer for the truth's sake. It is a promise of 'rest'—rest to the troubled—a rest which the righteous Lord would award to them "when the Lord Jesus

Digitized by Google

shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, taking vengeance on those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of his Son, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all those that believe." (2 Thess. i. 7—10.)

When near the close of his career, we find the same apostle committing a solemn charge to Timothy, his own son in the faith, which he introduces and enforces in these terms: 'I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead at his appearing and and his kingdom; preach the word,' etc. "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but to all them also that *love his appearing.*" (2 Tim. iv. 6, 7.) 'The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men,' says the same writer in his letter to Titus, 'hath appeared; teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly desires, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, looking for the blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ.' (Titus ii. 12, 13.) It is thus evident that the second appearing of the Lord Jesus was a subject of the greatest moment to the apostle Paul, and to the churches of the saints to which his letters are addressed.

The same fact characterises the letters of the other apostles preserved to us in the New Testament. Hear James: "Be patient, brethren, *unto the coming of the Lord.* Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." (James v. 7, 8.) Hear Peter: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto *salvation ready to be revealed* in the last time; wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, you are in heaviness through manifold trials; that the trial of your faith being much more precious than gold, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honour, and glory, *at the appearing of Jesus Christ.* Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought to you *at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" (1 Peter i. 3—7, 13.)

Listen to John: "And now, little children, abide in him, that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed at his coming." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear [that is, it is not yet manifested] what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is; and every one that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." (1 John iii. 28; iv. 2.)

Once more: Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, testifieth that 'Enoch, the seventh from Adam,' made the following prophetic announcement: "Behold *the Lord cometh* with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all

Digitized by Google

their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." (Jude 14, 15.)

There is another fact in relation to the teaching of our blessed Lord and his apostles, and the faith and hope of the first believers, to which we would also call attention—namely, *that the appearing of the Lord Jesus, and the gathering together of the saints to himself, was an object not only of desire, but also of* CONSTANT EXPECTATION. This has appeared in some of those passages already quoted, and is clearly stated in many others, such as the following: "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness and put on the armour of light." (Rom. xiii. 12, 13.) "You [Corinthians] come behind in no gift, *waiting* for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. i. 7.) "The Lord direct your hearts into the patient waiting for Christ." (2 Thess. iii. 5.) "Of the times and the seasons, brethren, you have no need that I write unto you, for you yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others, but let us watch and be sober." (1 Thess. v. 2—6.) "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand." (Phil. iv. 5.) "He that testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus." (Rev. xxii. 20.)

The constant *waiting* and *watching* for the coming of the Lord was based on the fact *that they did not know how soon he might appear.* That they did expect his speedy appearing is manifest; but how soon it might be they knew not. The Lord Jesus himself said that he would come suddenly—like a flash of lightning—and that the *time* of his appearing was hid from men and angels, yea, even from himself. "Therefore," says he, "watch, for you know not at what hour your Lord come." (Matt. xxiv. 36—44; Mark xiii. 32—37.)

There is one passage which is often cited against the idea we are now illustrating, namely, 2 Thess. ii. 1—12: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way; and then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming; even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and all deceiveableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

Digitized by Google

One writer on the second coming of the Lord,* avers that the apostle here 'fearlessly crushes' the idea that 'the day of Christ was at hand,' and that no 'pre-millennialist' would employ the language of the apostle, as he would be afraid of destroying the possibility of watching.' (pp. 42, 43.) Now, whatever be the meaning of the apostle's language here, it is a fact that he tells the Christians at Rome that 'the day is at hand;' and, that this idea was not peculiar to him, but was taught also by the other New Testament writers, we have already had ample proof. Can it be that the apostle here seeks to 'destroy' what he and his fellow apostles commonly taught? No such thing. The mistake arises from a wrong translation of the Greek word rendered 'at hand.'

The term used in Rom. xiii. 12 (*eggiken*) is, undoubtedly, correctly translated, 'at hand.' "And that, knowing the time that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is AT HAND: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light.' The same word is frequently so rendered in the New Testament; but this is far from being the case with the term employed in 2 Thess. ii. 2 (*enesteken*). It is never in any other instance rendered 'at hand' by our translators; and in several instances they render it 'present,' in opposition to 'future,' or 'coming.' Observe its use in the following passages:—"For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things PRESENT, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Rom. viii. 38.) "Therefore let no man glory in men, for all things are yours: whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or things PRESENT, or things to come; all are yours." (1 Cor. iii. 21, 22.) "I suppose, therefore, that this is good for the PRESENT distress." (1 Cor. vii. 26.) Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this PRESENT evil world, according to the will of God and our Father." (Gal. i. 4.) "Which was a figure for the time then PRESENT, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience." Heb. ix. 9. 'Present,' not 'at hand,' is evidently its meaning here. The sense of the passage, and the uniform testimony of the apostles, demand this. So rendered, the passage runs thus: "We beseech you, brethren, concerning the coming of the Lord, and our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit or by letter as from us that the day of Christ is present;" that is, already come.

It was not to crush their hopes, or allay their 'feverish enthusiasm,' regarding the speedy appearing of their glorified Redeemer, that the apostle wrote those words of caution, but contrariwise, to prevent their being 'shaken in mind'—to quiet their fears that the day of the Lord was already present. Nothing short of the greatest misconception of the earnest desire, hope, and expectation of the early Christians could lead any one

* "Christ's Second Coming; will it be Pre-millennial?" By the Rev. David Brown, D.D., formerly of St. James's Free Church, Glasgow, now of Aberdeen. [Dr. Brown has been replied to by Dr. H. Bonar, whose "Prophetical Landmarks" we cordially recommend to the reader's perusal.]

Digitized by Google

for a moment to imagine that the church of the Thessalonians had any reason to be 'troubled' because the day of Christ was at hand: for was it not at 'that day' that the holy apostle expected to receive from his Saviour's hands 'a crown of righteousness'—a crown that shall be awarded not to him alone, but to all those also who love that Saviour's appearing?

But, on the other hand, the notion which some men appear to have been at pains to teach the brethren at Thessalonica—the notion that the day of Christ had already come, while the brethren who had fallen asleep had not awaked, but were slumbering still, and they themselves yet unchanged, and all things remained as formerly, afforded cause for their being troubled and shaken in mind—it is to remove this idea, or to prevent its being believed, that the apostle employs the language in question.

Viewed in the light of the context, this passage, so far from destroying the possibility of watching, is in perfect harmony with those other Scriptures we have cited; and from what has been advanced, it is trusted the reader will clearly perceive that THE SECOND APPEARING OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST WAS A MATTER OF INTENSE DESIRE, EARNEST HOPE, AND CONSTANT EXPECTATION TO THE APOSTLES, AND THE CHURCHES TO WHICH THE EPISTLES ARE ADDRESSED.

And so it was also regarded by the church down to the beginning of the fourth century. Justin Martyr, who lived within thirty years of the apostle John's death, testifies that in his time, the return of the Lord to reign on the earth was received by all true Christians, and denied by none but those who denied the resurrection.

"The whole primitive church," writes Madame Gasparin, "expected the coming of Christ, and believed in his temporal (*i.e.*, his personal) reign. This belief, so strong and firm in apostolic times, faded in proportion as faith lost its early simplicity. Men took to materialise precepts, and spiritualise prophecy, and thus truth got modified on both sides." —*Near and Heavenly Horizons*, p. 296.

The late Dr. Chalmers, towards the close of his days, expressed the same hope and expectation:—"Above all, let us wait for the coming of the Son of man; and let my constant attitude be that of one who looketh for the Saviour." Again, "Meanwhile let us wait for the coming of the Lord, who will destroy all adversaries, and will dissipate every darkening influence by the brightness of his appearance. I desire to cherish a more habitual and practical faith than heretofore in that coming which even the first Christians were called to hope for with all earnestness. . . . . How much more we who are so much nearer to this great fulfilment than at the time when they believed!"—*Sabbath Scripture Readings*, vol. i. pp. 108—311.

And now, dear reader, permit the question, how stands it with you? Do you love the appearing of the Lord from heaven, and live in continual longing and expectation of his coming? If not, then you have not the hope of the early church, which is indeed 'the hope of the gospel.' For unless that same Jesus return from heaven to deliver us from death and the grave, and endow us with immortality; to gather together the people of Israel from all lands into the land promised to Abraham and his seed, and turn away ungodliness from Jacob; return to reign in righteousness on Mount Zion, God's holy hill, over Israel and all nations—unless he

Digitized by Google

return to perform all this, there is no gospel of salvation, my dear friend, for you or me, or any son of Adam. Search the Scriptures, and see if it be not so. Was not the 'kingdom of God' the grand theme of the preaching of Jesus and his apostles? And did not Jesus intimate that "this gospel of the kingdom should be preached in all the world?" And is not the record of this preaching in such terms as these: "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptised, both men and women?" How, then, can you have the "faith of the gospel as once delivered to the saints?" Unless you are convinced of the truth concerning the kingdom of God, as predicted by Moses and the prophets, and preached by Jesus and his apostles, how can you love the appearing of him who is Jehovah's Christ or Anointed for that kingdom? And if you love not his appearing, where is the ground of your confidence for acceptance with him? Ponder, I beseech you, these words: "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and UNTO THEM THAT LOOK FOR HIM shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." (Heb. ix. 28). Unto them that *look for* him, is the promise of salvation here given, Most assuredly, that same Jesus, who is gone into heaven, shall return to earth; and his return shall seal our eternal salvation or everlasting destruction. Either we shall be made like him, and see him as he is, or be smitten to death by the breath of his mouth; for "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe." (2 Thess. i. 7—10.) "Be ye therefore ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh."

W. LAING.

*** This Paper may be had in Tract Form, at 3s. per hundred, from W. LAING, 11, Beaumont-place, Edinburgh.

THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS.*

BEFORE we come to consider the great question of The Second Death, as it is treated by Mr. Jukes, we would wish to refer for a moment to a very favourite idea of his which we meet with throughout his book, and to what appears to us a very unsound defence of it from Scripture. He thinks it incorrect to say that the calling of Christians is "to be delivered *from* death;" he thinks their calling is to be delivered "*by*" death. (p. 66.) At pp. 27, 28 he thus states his view, that it is God's "will to make death, judgment, and destruction, the means and way to life, acquittal, and salvation; in other words, '*through death to* destroy him that has the power

* "The Second Death and the Restitution of All Things." By Andrew Jukes. Second Edition. London: Longmans. 1869.
"Doctrine of Annihilation." *Rainbow* of July, 1869. By Ditto.

Digitized by Google

of death, that is the devil, and to deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.'" (Heb. ii. 14.)

It is surprising how often this text from Hebrews recurs in Mr. Jukes's writings. We perpetually meet with it. But while in its sound it appears to support his theory, it really gives it no countenance, as a moment's consideration will show. The "Death, Judgment, and Destruction," of which Mr. Jukes speaks in the first part of his sentence, are the "Death and Destruction" *of the sinner;* the death through which the Devil is destroyed, and of which the writer of Hebrews speaks, is *the death of Christ.* It is quite plain therefore that this text, so often quoted, affords no support to Mr. Jukes's theory that sinners are delivered *through their death.* The teaching of this text, as of the entire Scriptures, is that *through the death of Christ* voluntarily endured for sinners, sinners are delivered *from the death* which is the penalty of transgression. Death when spoken absolutely of the sinner, and not expressly used in some secondary sense, is always regarded in Scripture as an enemy and a curse, *from which* Christ is to free his people, not through which they are freed.

We pass over Mr. Jukes's teaching on the subject of the first death, or that bodily dissolution which both righteous and wicked suffer here. (pp. 87, 88.) It is not that we agree with him even here. To us he appears to regard this death much in the way that Socrates or Plato would consider it, that is as a release and a blessing. We hold this view to be radically wrong. Scripture regards it as an enemy and a curse, from which deliverance is to be brought by Christ at his coming. Here we find the leaven of heathen philosophy penetrating deeply through Mr. Jukes's ideas, doubtless quite unconsciously. Nor is this to be wondered at, for we find this very same leaven influencing most powerfully the religious literature not of one school only, but of almost every school of Christian theology. In essays, and sermons, and speeches, and popular hymns, we find the Platonic view of death often much more prominent than the view which God gives us of it in his word. However we cannot now dwell upon this, but must pass on to the most remarkable feature in Mr. Jukes's writings, his theory of the Second Death.

According to Mr. Jukes man, in his fall, died "a double death," and must therefore in his recovery from the fall also undergo "a double death." Man's first and second deaths, incurred in his fall, were *evils;* man's first and second deaths, undergone in his recovery, are *blessings.* The two deaths incurred in the fall affected man's spirit and man's body; the two deaths incurred in man's recovery must also affect these two portions of his nature, his spirit and his body. By the two deaths incurred in the fall, "Man who is a spirit lost the place which God had given him, the Paradise, called by Paul 'the third heaven,' and was driven out and fell into the kingdom of darkness, his inward life turned, like sweet wine to sourest vinegar, into a life of ceaseless aching restlessness—while his body became like that of the beasts, subject to the elements of this world, and to all the change and toil which make up the course of this world." (pp. 69, 70.) Such according to Mr. Jukes was man's fall, affecting spirit and body, endured on the day when man disobeyed. A little further on he thus describes it: "We are, as Scripture and our own hearts tell us, *not only in body in this outward world,* but *in our spirits are living in a spiritual world,* which surely is not heaven, for no soul of man till regenerate is at rest or satisfied."

Digitized by Google

(p. 70.) Such was man's "double death," or his first and second deaths, incurred by him when he fell. They are evils, miseries, curses, from which he wants and will obtain deliverance.

His deliverance from these two deaths are, according to Mr. Jukes, by his *undergoing two corresponding deaths,* namely, bodily death, and that death which Scripture speaks of as "*the second death.*" By these two latter deaths the two former are abolished. Accordingly, *all* who had suffered the former must also undergo the latter. One of these deaths is not sufficient for any one; both alike must be endured. They are the way —the only way—back to the life which man lost at the fall. Being fallen, says Mr. Jukes, "*the only way out of these worlds is death;* so long as we live their life, we must be in them. *To get out of them therefore we must die—die to this elemental nature,* to get out of the seen world, *and die to sin,* to get out of the dark world, called in Scripture 'the power of darkness.' And since the life of the one is toil and change, and the life of the other is dissatisfaction and inward restlessness, *we must die to both* if we would be free from the changes of this world, and from the restlessness and dissatisfaction in which by nature our spirits are. *Only by such a death are we delivered.*" (pp. 70—71.)

It will be remarked that Mr. Jukes here speaks of two deaths, the first what we generally mean by death, viz., the death of the body, called by Mr. Jukes in his somewhat obscure language, "death to this elemental nature;" and the second a "death to sin," which as we shall see is identified by Mr. Jukes with what John calls in Revelation "the second death." It will also be remarked that Mr. Jukes describes *both* as equally essential to deliverance, as means of recovery, as pathways to the blessed life we want, and as therefore equally essential to all. Both these first and second deaths must be undergone by every man, whether "first-born" or "later-born," though the second of them may be undergone by these different classes in different "ages" or worlds. Indeed he tells us that not only must all who fell undergo this first and second death, but that Christ also himself endured both—"Christ died this double death for us." (p. 70.) We have already referred, as far as space permitted, to the first of these deaths, but must give more particular attention to the second.

This second death then is, according to Mr. Jukes, essential for all mankind. (p. 70.) It most strongly resembles what we here call "*Conversion*"—"a passage, first through waters, then through fires; a change involving a 'death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness;' the death not annihilating the fallen spirit, but rather being the appointed means for bringing forth and perfecting the new life." (p. 81.) As thus the means of deliverance, and the passage out of the dark world of fallen nature, it ought to be rejoiced in and longed for, even as Christ longed for that baptism of which he said, "How am I straitened until it be accomplished." It should be in us, too, "that burning," which St. Peter teaches, "is made to prove us," and at which we should 'rejoice, inasmuch as we are thus partakers of Christ's sufferings;' that 'therefore we are buried by baptism into death;' and therefore we look to be 'baptised with the Holy Ghost and fire;' not surely to annihilate, but rather through judgment to perfect us." (p. 82.) This second death is in every case, and whenever endured "part of (God's) redeeming plan," involving, alike in the case of all, "the pledge of true blessing." (pp. 86, 87.)

Digitized by Google

Thus to all a deliverance, a blessing, a cause for deep rejoicing, a source of gratitude, Mr. Jukes, in the carrying out of his theory, notices *differences* as to time and place, and other circumstances, which he teaches, of this second death *according as it affects different classes of mankind*, whom he divides by the term, "elect and non-elect," "first-born and later born." These distinctive terms are equivalent with the scriptural terms "believers and unbelievers," "just and unjust," "righteous and wicked." (pp. 86, 87.)

The elect, according to Mr. Jukes, undergo the second death in this present state of existence. It is thus, with him, nothing but that "death to sin," of which the Scriptures speak as passing on the regenerate. That these do die to sin of course we do not dispute. It is one of the blessed truths of the gospel which we are as forward to maintain as Mr. Jukes himself can be. Our only difference *here* with Mr. Jukes is, that the death to sin which the believer dies is a totally different thing from that second death which St. John teaches us that the reprobate will die in the lake of fire. All the texts which Mr. Jukes enumerates as descriptive of the blessed change by which God's people here put off the old man with his deeds, and crucify the flesh, we rely on and believe just as much as he, only that while he makes them descriptive of a process identical with that which takes place "in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone," we denounce his teaching as flatly contradictory to God's blessed word. However, as this point will come in afterwards for consideration, we will not dwell further on it now.

For those who have not undergone what Mr. Jukes call the second death in this present age or life the process will, according to him, be undergone in some coming age after the judgment. "The second death," he tells us, "so far from being, as some think, the hopeless shutting up of man for ever in the curse of disobedience, will, if I err not, be God's way to free those who in no other way than by such a death can be delivered out of the dark world, whose life they live in. The saints have died with Christ, not only "to the elements of this world," but also to "sin," that is, the dark spirit-world. By the first, they are freed from the bondage of sense; by the second, from the bondage of sin, in all its forms of pride, envy, wrath, and selfishness. The ungodly have not so died to sin. At the death of the body, therefore, and still more when they are raised to judgment, because their spirit yet lives, they are still within the limits of that dark and fiery world, the life of which has been and is the life of their spirit. To get out of this world there is but one way, death; *not the first, for that is passed, but the second death.*" (p. 87.)

We thus see the view which Mr. Jukes takes of that awful scene, which is opened out to our view in various parts of Scripture, under the titles, "Hell," "The Lake of Fire," "The Second Death." It is with him the way of recovery for all who have not been restored before, embracing in this view not only men but devils. (p. 131.) In this light, and as restoring far more than had been brought back to God's life, this second death in hell is, as compared with the second death here undergone as the harvest is to the scanty first-fruits. (p. 79.) It is a part of the plan of redemption, resembling conversion here; it is the baptism of the Holy Ghost undergone in a future age, and to be rejoiced in by those who undergo it. (pp. 81, 82, 85.)

Besides the different circumstances of time and place, which to some degree distinguish the second death in the lake of fire from the second

Digitized by Google

death as undergone by the "elect" on this earth, Mr. Jukes makes another distinction in *respect to the amount of pain and suffering* which accompanies this death at these different periods. In both cases he tells us there is "judgment," but this judgment may be of a lighter or a heavier kind. "God's elect," he tells us, "accept this judgment *here* that their carnal mind may die, and the old man be slain with all his enmity. *The world reject God's judgment here, and therefore have to meet it in a more awful form in the* resurrection of judgment in the coming world." (p. 75.) The reason Mr. Jukes gives for its greater severity hereafter than now is rather curious: he says, "While here, *through the burdens and infirmities of 'this vile body' our fallen spirit is more easily broken,* and we die to sin more quickly, though even here we need both fires and waters, to make us die to that self-willed life which is our misery. Who can tell how much harder this death may be to those, who having gone hence, *have not the burden of 'this vile body' to humble the pride of that fallen spirit,* which, while unbroken, is hell, and which must die in us if we would reach God's rest." (p. 75.)

We do not know on what grounds Mr. Jukes makes the presence of the "vile body" *an aid* in the process of regeneration; we rather think that Scripture represents it the opposite way. (Rom. vii. 23, 25.) Nor do we allow for a moment that, "in the resurrection of judgment in the coming world," the wicked will be free from "the burden of this vile body" which here they have. Mr. Jukes himself allows that "in that awful spirit-world, at the resurrection of judgment," the spirit will be "*with its proper and appropriate body.*" (*Rainbow*, p. 311.) We know not what body can be proper to the spirit, yet vile, than a body resembling it and therefore vile; and we cannot therefore see how even Mr. Jukes can make it out that in the resurrection of judgment the spirit of the "non-elect" has any other than "this vile body" with which here it is clothed. That it has the glorified body of which Paul speaks, in the fifteenth of 1 Corinthians, is an idea which Scripture utterly rejects.

We now proceed to give our reasons why we utterly reject Mr. Jukes's theory of the second death.

In the first place, let us remember that it is Scripture which has given this process, of whatever nature it may be, that name by which it is known —"*The Second Death*" (Rev. xx. 14); the name is therefore an appropriate one. In calling it the *second* death, we can only suppose that it is so called because *it comes after and follows the first death.* As the second child in a family is the child who is born after the first, as the second woe in the Book of Revelation is the woe which succeeds the first, so we can only naturally suppose that the second death is so called because it comes *after the first.* But Mr. Jukes makes it, *in order of time, the first death.* We must remember that he makes this second death to be identical with the "death to sin" which "the elect" undergo in this present life. (p. 70.) In the case of all the "elect," this "death to sin" is a process which they undergo *before* they suffer that bodily death which Mr. Jukes calls a death "to this elemental nature." If his idea, therefore, of the nature of the second death were correct, it ought rather to be called "the *first* death." Scripture then, in calling it the *second,* leads us to conclude that *is not* that "death to sin" with which Mr. Jukes would identify it, and which precedes instead of following bodily death.

Digitized by Google

Again, Mr. Jukes's theory is that those whom he terms "the elect," or "first-born," undergo the second death *just as truly*, though not by so painful a process, as the "non-elect" or "later born." (p. 70.) He holds it just as essential for the former as for the latter. It is their only way out of that dark world which is "the power of darkness." The redeemed people of Christ must, according to him, *on this earth undergo that second death* which the "non-elect" must undergo in hell. Unfortunately for Mr. Jukes's theory it is flatly contradicted by Scripture. We are told in the Word of God that the "elect," or redeemed people of Christ, *do not and never shall undergo this second death at all.* Whatever it is they have nothing to say to it. Whatever be its nature it is not for them. Thus our Lord says, "If a man keep my saying, *he shall never see death.*" (John viii. 51.) Mr. Jukes allows this to be the *second* death, and indeed there can be no doubt that it is of that death that Christ speaks. But here we find that Christ promises an absolute redemption from this death to all who keep his sayings. They do not therefore undergo this second death at any time. Their exemption from it is secured to them by the word of their Lord. It is not therefore that "death to sin" which Mr. Jukes supposes it to be, and which all the redeemed of Christ do undergo, and which they are taught to regard, not as a curse to be exempt from, but a blessing for which they are to thank the God of grace and of salvation. (Rom. vi. 11.)

The same exemption of the redeemed from undergoing this second death is even more explicitly assured to them by our Lord in the Book of Revelation: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; *he that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.*" (Chap. ii. 11.) And in the end of this same book St. John repeats the declaration which his Master had so solemnly made: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; *on such the second death hath no power.*" (Chap. xx. 6.) We are utterly at a loss therefore to know how Mr. Jukes, with the Scriptures before him, dares to maintain that the "elect" endure the second death. Scripture tells us they do not—Mr. Jukes tells us they do. He is here the opponent, not the exponent, of God's word. He is not here the humble follower of the Spirit's teaching, but the setter up of a system of his own, *which he maintains in defiance of plain Scripture by certain types and figures of the Old Testament, selected and interpreted by himself!*

Another objection fatal to Mr. Jukes's theory is, that whereas he represents the second death to be a process which is now being undergone, and which has constantly been going on ever since sin entered into the world, *Scripture represents it as a process yet future and not to be undergone until after the general resurrection and judgment.* So our Lord teaches us in the text from Revelation above referred to—"He that overcometh *shall not be hurt of the second death.*" (Chap. ii. 11.) He here speaks of this death *as a future thing.* It was not something of the time then present, or of the times long past; it was something looming in the distant future. This is also expressly declared by St. John farther on in this book. He is speaking of the general judgment, and of its consequences: "The sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and Hades delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to his works. And death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. *This is the second*

Digitized by Google

death." (Chap. xx. 13, 14.) Here we see that what our Lord described as yet future when he spoke. John gives its distinct definite place in the times of the future. That which Mr. Jukes would fain persuade us had been taking place ever since and when sinners returned to the Father whom they had left, our Lord and his apostle John tell us has not yet taken place, and will not take place until some yet future period, which none of us can fix. We must traverse in thought all the time that has gone by since the first Adam sinned—all the time that may yet elapse ere the second Adam restores all things—*before the second death is a reality felt or experienced by a single individual.* It is not therefore that "death to sin" which Mr. Jukes imagines. He is living in a world of dream-land, where he accepts fancies for facts. Another fatal objection to Mr. Jukes's theory of the second death arises *from its essential opposition in character to that which Scripture calls the second death.* No special pleading can reconcile them; no vague, ambiguous, mysterious language thrown around them can make us think them one. No arbitrary, capricious, self-chosen system of typology can identify them; they are opposites—contradictories. *Mr. Jukes's "second death" is a blessing; the second death of Scripture is a curse.*

We will here consider it solely in reference to the "*non-elect,*" to those who, having here rejected God's offers, or having never had them made to them, are to endure their second death in hell. Mr. Jukes no doubt makes the process, as undergone in hell, to be a severer one than that undergone by the "elect" on earth. Even so it is, according to him, *of the very same kind* in respect both of "elect" and "non-elect"—*for both "through the fires."* (p. 76.) But however severe the process may be for the "non-elect," it is, according to Mr. Jukes, for them a blessed process, a work of redemption, leading them out of the dark world of the fall into man's old world of light, and love, and joy. As such it is a process to be rejoiced in, and so Mr. Jukes expressly declares it is a subject for rejoicing. (p. 82.)

Now, it is quite possible that the contemplation of it, as accompanied by pain more or less severe and protracted, might cause those who were to endure it to shrink back from the time when they must go "through the fires" of the second death, retrace their way to God's world of light. We know that the "elect" now often do this, and need the assurance of God's grace with them, and of the glorious issue that awaits them, to enable them to pass through the "waters" and the "rivers," the "fire" and "flame," which represent that path of trial by which the "elect" are now travelling out of the realms of sin into the new Kingdom of God. We should therefore expect that yet greater dread should be experienced at the prospect of the yet more "fiery trial" which the second death should prove in hell. But while we fully admit this, and allow that Scripture might urge upon men rather to accept the judgment of the "green tree" now than of the "dry tree" hereafter; rather now to "run with the footmen" than hereafter have "to contend with horses;" yet we certainly also should find Scripture speaking of the second death in hell as it speaks of the "death to sin" here, as in its issue and consequences, a blessing to the "non-elect," if it were indeed to the "non-elect" as Mr. Jukes dreams, *their way back to God's life.*

For it would be to them *an incalculable blessing.* No language could adequately describe its blessedness. The tongue of angels, who know the light that it would be leading to, could not do it justice. The way out of

Digitized by Google

darkness, out of sinfulness, out of misery, out of restlessness, into peace, and joy, and holiness, and light, would certainly draw forth from the Spirit that lightened the minds and guided the pens of the writers of Scripture some sweet words of hope, some cheering words of consolation, some glowing expressions bursting forth at the prospect that lay beyond the valley of the shadow of the second death.

But have any such words been spoken? Where, in speaking of the judgment of the "non-elect," is there from first to last of Scripture one hint given that while it is full of pain it is yet more full of blessing? Where, in God's word, when the second death is spoken of, is there the smallest indication that it is the way to the true better life? Nowhere. But words of opposite meaning are always uttered; words of dark omen, uncheered by one ray of light.

Ezekiel speaks of this second death. (Chap. xviii.) He speaks of it as awaiting the wicked. (Chap. xxiii. 4.) According to Mr. Jukes it is the very thing which the wicked, who has departed this life unforgiven, has to look for as the way back to that life of God which he here failed to find. Now is this the way in which Ezekiel speaks of this second death? Could all the special pleading that ever exerted itself to make the worse appear the better cause, extract out of the words of Ezekiel the idea that the wicked man's death, of which he speaks, was the wicked man's God-appointed way to life and light! Here are Ezekiel's word's: "*Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord; and not that he should return from his ways, and live?*" Is God's view of the second death the same as that of Mr. Jukes? If so, God would take pleasure, yea, infinite pleasure in it; for, according to Mr. Jukes, it is God's way by which he that is dead becomes alive again, and he that was lost is found. We should have it described in the language of the Prodigal's Parable. We should hear of the robe, the ring, the fatted calf, the music, and the dancing, instead of the hopeless wail and the garments of sackcloth, heard and seen where mourners mourn without hope over their dead.

Let us hear Christ's description of the second death in hell, and see if it sanctions in any degree Mr. Jukes's theory of its nature. Thus he speaks of it: "If thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." What meaning does Mr. Jukes place on these words? He rejects Augustine's sense of them! So do we with all our hearts. Let who will fancy his God a Being who has provided for myriads of his creatures an eternity of life in hell. Such a scene as Romish priests teach—"*permissu superiorum*"—to be exhibited in hell: "See! on the middle of that hot floor stands a girl; she looks about sixteen years old. . . . . Listen! she speaks. She says, I have been standing on this red-hot floor for years. Day and night my only standing-place has been this red hot floor. . . . . Look at my burnt and bleeding feet. Let me go off this burning floor for one moment, only for one single short moment!"* We believe it is only *a devil* who could paint God as acting thus. Well, we both reject this as Christ's meaning in the awful words recorded by Mark, and will probably accept the same sense of the unquenchable

* "History of European Morals." By W. E. H. Leckey. II. 237.

Digitized by Google

fire as meaning a fire which no power can quench *until it has done its appointed work.* Mr. Jukes and we both know that this is the meaning of "unquenchable fire" in common life and in Scripture. But we ask Mr. Jukes to tell us candidly what he supposes to be *here the work* appointed for this fire to accomplish. We say it is a work of severe judgment, whose unfailing result is the loss of life. *Will Mr. Jukes say that its result is blessing*—blessing for which eternity only will be long enough to thank God for? If so, he and we read Scripture from very different points of view. No close scanning of these words of Christ can show in them, to our minds, aught but indications of doom.

We will go on to another Scripture, which speaks of the second death, and see if it admits of Mr. Jukes's fond conceit. Our Lord is addressing the church in Smyrna. (Rev. ii. 7—11.) He praises it for its fidelity, and encourages it to endure the persecution which awaited it. His grand motive to such endurance is that "*he that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.*" We have already seen that this Scripture promises an absolute exemption of Christ's people from the second death, and thus overthrows one main pillar of Mr. Jukes's theory. We have now to remark, that in saying that those who are not redeemed on this earth, shall endure the second death, it overthrows his other main position. According to Mr. Jukes, the second death will be to them the greatest blessing which it will be possible for them to receive. According to our Lord, it will be to them an injury and a hurt. It is quite plain, therefore, that Mr. Jukes's view of the second death is totally different from that of Christ, and is therefore, we hope, Mr. Jukes will allow, *wrong.*

We will refer to one other text which confirms this, if indeed confirmation were required. It is the declaration of St. John: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; *on such the second death hath no power.*" (Rev. xx. 6.) We are here taught that those who do not partake of the first resurrection shall endure the second death. We are told that over them it will have power to perform whatever function it is appointed by God to discharge. According to Mr. Jukes this, its function, is a most blessed one; it is that of delivering "out of the dark world, called in Scripture 'the power of darkness . . . . and from the restlessness and dissatisfaction in which by nature our spirits are.'" (p. 70.) This is truly blessed. But is this the light in which John draws the second death? No. He tells us it is a blessed thing to have nothing whatsoever to say or to do with it.

We see then clearly Mr. Jukes's fundamental error. He has, in his strong desire to bestow life where God has threatened death, confounded two things which are as opposite to each other as light is to darkness. He has confounded the death to sin, which is the blessed work of God's Spirit on regenerate souls in this present life, with the second death, which is God's work of judgment on wicked souls in hell. Every one of his positions on this question is untenable. The "elect" *never* endure the second death. The second death is *never* regarded as a blessing, or a work of redemption, no matter from what point of view it is looked at in Scripture. Mr. Jukes indeed, like Mr. Birks in his "History of Divine Goodness," has persuaded himself that it is a part of Christ's blessed work of redemption; but God's word contradicts both of these able writers, and by God's word we will abide. Who, unwarped by a master passion,

Digitized by Google

would ever suppose that the process described in Revelation xxi. 8 is the identical process that Paul describes in Romans vi. 2—11? *Mr. Jukes thinks it is!* The process with him is the same; the time and place are different! But the process is as different as either time or place. Paul speaks of the destruction of sin in the believer; John speaks of the destruction of the sinner in hell. The former is "The Death to Sin;" the latter is "The Second Death."

Mr. Jukes, however, maintains that besides the types from the Old Testament, which he selects at his own pleasure, and interprets at his own fancy, he has some plain Scriptures which support his view of the second death. We will examine them. One is taken from Rev. xxi. 5—8, which we will thank our readers to consult. Mr. Juke's comment on the place is as follows:—"what does he (God) say here but that "all things shall be made new," *though in the way to this,* the fearful and unbelieving must pass the lake of fire. *And does not the fact that the threatened judgment comes under, and is part of, the promise, "I make all things new,"* show that the second death is not outside of or unconnected with it, but is rather the appointed means to bring it about in some cases" (86). We doubt if one reader in a million would ever suppose that "the threatened judgment" of verse eight was part of "the promise" of verse five. Yet Mr. Jukes says it is *"a fact"* that it is. Will Mr. Jukes point out to us any authority for this assumed "fact" of his? The judgment comes *after* the promise, but that little word *"but"* in the beginning of the eighth verse *disconnects it from the promise,* and tells us *it is not a part of it.* Mr. Jukes must pardon us for saying that these particles, small as they are, are most important words.

If "the fact" that "the judgment" above-mentioned, *follows the mention* of "the blessing," also makes it a part of the blessing, is established as a principle of interpretation, we may make strange work with Scripture, or any book. We will draw Mr. Jukes's attention to a parallel case. In Isaiah i. 27—8, we read, "Zion shall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteousness. And the destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed." We have here a "threatened judgment" coming after "a promise." Does Mr. Jukes tell us that it is therefore *part of the promise?* It is in truth *a contrast to the promise.* And so is the judgment in Rev. xxi. 8, *contrasted* with the promise in xxi. 5. And so would every reader read it who had no pet theory for which he wanted, and must get a text. And such is the text which Mr. Jukes brings forward for his pet theory, that the second death is a blessed fruit of redemption!

But Mr. Jukes's theory obliges him to show that the "second death," though in its effect a blessing, *is not eternal.* It is with him in the case of the "later born" a very painful process, and therefore cannot last for ever. And this compels him to enter at large into the discussion of that much-vexed word αἰώνιος, generally rendered in our translation by "*everlasting.*" He attempts to make some use of the fact, that this Greek adjective is never applied in Scripture to the second death. But he knows he cannot rely on this as it is applied to other terms, as "Destruction," which Mr. Jukes allows to be synonymous with the second death. We cannot see therefore why Mr. Jukes should draw attention to the immaterial fact, that it is not verbally applied to the second death, when *in reality* it is.

Digitized by Google

But on this word αἰώνιος we would take the liberty to make a few remarks, as much directed to many advocates of our own view as to Mr. Jukes's. That this word αἰώνιος, when applied to the future life of the righteous, and to the future punishment of the wicked, means, in the strictest sense, "eternal," and "everlasting," even as God himself is eternal and everlasting, has always been contended for by the school of Augustine, while it has, as applied to the question of future punishment, been very generally disputed by those who have maintained that future punishment consists essentially in the loss of existence. Now, in the meaning attached to this term, coupled with the philosophical idea of the soul's inalienable immortality, is the stronghold of the heresy of the Augustinian school. We can easily refute them on the latter point, but in the former, as appears to me, their position is impregnable. All arguments, from whatever source drawn, are sophistical, and are felt to be so. And here many writers on our side afford them a triumph. They expend time, and pains, and learning, in attempting to establish a point which the true scholarship of their opponents tells them they always fail in establishing. Let us give up this argument. *We* want αἰώνιος, in its real sense of "eternal," just as much as the school of Augustine does. It is the impregnable defence of our position *against the school of Origen.* We need not dread it. It is for us, and not against us. With us the sinner is deprived of the eternal life bestowed by Christ, and this eternal deprivation of life is his eternal everlasting punishment. It is a punishment true and real though unfelt by those who endure it, felt and recognised by all whom it is intended to affect, namely, the unfallen creation of God.

The word αἰώνιος would appear to signify *the entire of whatever period it is applied to,* and it is constantly applied to the grand eternal period of coming time, and therefore constantly means "eternal" in the fullest sense of that term. The argument from its use, in Matt. xxv. 46, as urged by Augustine's school, and by ourselves as much, is simply this: The life of the righteous in the coming age, and the punishment of the wicked, are expressed by this same term αἰώνιος. As the former is an eternal life, so the latter is an eternal punishment. The usual argument by dissidents, of whatever school, is, that αἰώνιος is sometimes applied *to limited periods of time,* and may therefore be supposed to be so applied in one of the clauses of Matt. xxv. 46; and that, while as applied to the righteous it signifies *an eternal life,* as applied to the wicked it means *a temporary punishment.* This argument is, to our minds, essentially bad. It is a sophism, an evasion, an abuse of language for an obvious purpose. If αἰώνιος *ever* means eternal, and if, in the first clause of that, it means eternal, it seems to us to follow, as a matter of course, that in the second clause it has the same meaning.

Mr. Jukes, doubtless, has seen this as clearly as we do. He sees the lameness, the halting, the inconclusiveness of such an argument. He avoids it altogether. But he avoids it by what we must term the most desperate leap that a classical scholar could venture on. We should not have expected it from a Cambridge University prizeman. Our University of Dublin would not, we dare affirm, afford a scholar to endorse Mr. Jukes's view, or his support of it. In a word, then, while we have never before met or heard of any scholar who maintained more than that αἰώνιος did not *always* mean "eternal," Mr. Jukes takes a much stronger view, and hold *that it never means "eternal."* (pp. 63, 64.)

Digitized by Google

He takes a way which no true philologist will ever take, *by itself* to establish the sense of a term, namely, *its derivation*. Αιωνιος, he tells us, comes from αιων and αιων signifies a limited period; and therefore αιωνιος can never mean more than a limited period. (p. 64.) Mr. Jukes here falls into two errors. First, he is wrong in supposing that αιων *always* signifies "a limited period:" it also signifies "*eternity*." (Liddell and Scott on αιων.) Secondly, he is wrong in supposing that if αιων signified only a limited period, its derivation, αιωνιος, must needs therefore only refer to a limited period. The sense of words wanders widely from their roots, and the sense of words differs widely at one time from their sense at another. Etymology is never to be despised in our interpretation of terms, but it is also never to be relied upon exclusively, or even chiefly. *The usage of words* is the real standard of their sense; this we must follow through all its changes if we are to interpret them aright. Mr. Jukes abandons this test in the case of αιωνιος, and falls back upon its root, and in doing so does not even give to this root its full latitude of sense!

It is quite sufficient, then, in reply to Mr. Jukes's assertion that αἰώνιος never does and never can mean "eternal," to say that it not only may, but does constantly in Greek usage, mean "eternal." We open "Liddell and Scott's Dictionary," and find the senses there given to be, "*lasting*," "*eternal*;" and we also find that all the words of whose composition this adjective forms a part, as αἰωνό-βιος, αἰωνο-τόκος, αἰωνο-χαρής, refer *exclusively* to an eternal duration. Mr. Jukes's most unwarrantable criticism on this term shows us the inestimable value of being able to appeal to the ordinary Greek usage of the language of the New Testament. This term, which Mr. Jukes would fain persuade us only means a limited period, is fortunately only an old Greek word, of established sense, before a line of the New Testament was written. In this New Testament, written for Greek readers, it is used in the sense already attached to it. We can appeal from Mr. Jukes's more than doubtful parentage of the term to the fine old Greek writers who knew nothing of Mr. Jukes's mystical theory of "ages," and "falls," and "restorations," but who have given to the term its established position in the society of language. These break roughly through Mr. Jukes's gossamer, as they rove with free, lithe limb through the brakes of Ithaca, or the heather of Ida and Hymettus. Homer, and Plato, and Euripides, and Demosthenes, please to tell Mr. Jukes the true meaning of αιωνιος. None knew it better than you, ye great masters of the Grecian tongue. There are many things the humblest Christian child knows which ye knew not, but in the meaning of the words of your noble language you are our teachers, and we your pupils. You have given the tongue in which the Christian evangelist has written the story of eternity.

We must, in order to do justice to Mr. Jukes, and to remove a not uncommon misconception, advert for a a moment to another of Mr. Jukes's criticisms on Greek terms. Here we freely admit he has stronger authority for his criticism than in the case of αἰωνιος, but for all that he is wrong. We must return, then, for a moment to Matt. xxv. 46. The wicked, we read here, "shall go away into everlasting *punishment*." The Greek word for "punishment" is κόλᾰσις. We may be sure this word has been closely scanned. The writers of the Origenistic school have bestowed upon it a great deal of attention. It is very constantly used in classic authors for

Digitized by Google

punishment inflicted with the view of correcting and improving those who are punished. The writers of Origen's school seize upon this fact, but in doing so they go beyond what it warrants, and must themselves receive a little correction, which we hope will improve them. That which is a *common* sense in classic usage they make an *exclusive* sense. Thus we find Mr. Dunn saying that it has "reference *to the correcting and bettering of him that endures it,*" and referring for authority to Archbishop Trench's "Synonyms of the New Testament." (Dunn's Kingdom of God, p. 182.) Mr. Jukes's bold assertion is, "the word which in this passage we translate 'punishment,' and which in its primary sense means simply 'pruning,' *is always used for a corrective discipline, which is for the improvement of him who suffers it.*" (p. 121.) He too appeals to the authority of Archbishop Trench. Now, when teachers appeal to authority, they ought to be sure that it bears them out. Archbishop Trench allows, as every Greek scholar will, that the correction of the party punished is a *usual* object of κολασις, but the Archbishop also knew this was not *its exclusive* usage, and therefore he says expressly that it is used "*for the most part*" in the above mild sense. The Archbishop gives no sanction to Mr. Jukes's assertion that it is thus "*always used.*" The truth is, that κολασις is used for punishment of every kind from that whose object is the correction of the party punished to that in which such an object is no part of it. See Liddell and Scott's Dictionary, which also, in explaining the meaning of its verb κολαξω, refers to two passages in the classics where it signifies *the punishment of death.* We here find Mr. Jukes appealing to classical usage for the sense of Greek terms when he thinks it favours his views. We only wish that he would *always* appeal to such usage, but be very careful that he appeals *to all the facts,* not to such of them only as make for him.

To one other argument of Mr. Jukes, in favour of his idea that the "second death" is not eternal, we will refer. He advances it very boldly as "the unquestionable teaching of Scripture." He tells us "*prophecy announces a day when there shall be no more death.*" (p. 106.) He infers from hence that the second death which the "non-elect" endure will not be eternal, because in that case death would always continue to be. Now prophecy undoubtedly does say this. Mr. Jukes takes the prediction from Rev. xxi. 4. There would be overwhelming force in his argument if the passage above quoted bore any reference to the second death, or to the punishment of the "non-elect." *But it is not speaking of this at all,* and therefore does not bear out with the minutest force Mr. Jukes's conclusion. It is *speaking of the "elect" alone,* and of what will be done *for them.* "God shall wipe away all tears *from their eyes;* and *there shall be no more death,* neither sorrow nor crying, etc.!" A few verses later the chapter speaks of the "non-elect," and there it speaks of sorrow and *death awaiting them.* (Verse 8.) Is such a use of Scripture its interpretation or its perversion? What right has Mr. Jukes to apply to one set of persons what is confined to another, and to tell us that he is laying before us the teaching of the Bible!

We have now done with Mr. Jukes's "Restitution of All Things." Into his arguments, as drawn from the ceremonial and political laws of Moses, we have no time to enter. Used as Mr. Jukes has used them, they might be made to prove anything and everything. If we were allowed to select

Digitized by Google

the typical ordinances, and the whole ceremonial and political ritual of Israel as we pleased, and to interpret them at our caprice, we could establish Romanism, or Mohammedanism, or Spiritualism, or any other "ism," as easily and satisfactorily as Mr. Jukes has established from them his "ism" of the second death. We will merely enter our protest against a system of interpretation that would turn the typical use of the Old Testament into a mockery and a jest.

HENRY CONSTABLE,
Prebendary of Cork.

Desertmore Glebe.

LETTERS ON THEMES OF DEEPEST MOMENT.

Sextus Calpurnius to his beloved Mother, greeting.

VI.

THOUGH only a few days have elapsed since I last wrote, yet I must write again. Let me confess to you my restless anxiety about this foulest conspiracy against the life of the Anointed One; and I see not the remotest possibility of circumventing the designs of these base men. This indictment of the Shiloh having claimed to be the king of this province, after it has been annexed to our Roman empire, paralyses my every effort. I have no quiet day or night; by night, dreams of evil portent haunt my slumbers; and by day, my mind is distracted by most anxious fears. To Cornelius, I cannot impart my anxieties; for it would make him as uneasy as myself, to no purpose. To my mother, however, I can communicate my heart-emotions, and there will be a sweet relief in thus giving vent to my griefs. O how I feel the absence of my dear Jehoiada. May I not call him my guardian genius; or, as Horatius Flaccus would say, "Numen, præsidium, dulce decus meum." I have risen from my couch; have trimmed my midnight lamp; and am conversing with you with my pen. Ah for the pen of my ready writer!

Just before sunset, Cornelius and I reached this Tower of Strato, at Cæsaræ, on our return from Sichem; whither we made our second visit last Sabbath: and need I say that I spent most happy hours with my two friends. They have been in labours most abundant during the last few days, travelling from village to village without purse or scrip. By most they have been received most gladly; by some have they been most rudely treated. There are not a few amongst the more influential of the Samaritans who are of the sect of the Sadducees. These men profess to be champions of freedom of thought; and talk boastfully of the republic of mind, and of broad views of things, especially those relating to religion. Hence they are bitterly opposed to the burdensome ritualism of the Pharisees. They have the conceit that they are greater thinkers than their fellows; and pretend that it is beneath the dignity of human reason to accept anything on trust; hence they utterly ignore all mysteries; and above all, do they scout the notion of spiritual existences: nor will they

Digitized by Google

credit the doctrine of a future state. In fact they would engraft upon Judaism the teachings of Epicurus. They have many adherents among the wealthier, the more influential, the more educated of the Jews; or, I ought rather to say, those who wish to be thought more intellectual, the patricians of their commonwealth of mind. The high priest, Caiaphas, is of this sect; and so are several members of the great Sanhedrim. As the Sadducees depreciate the pompous ceremonial of the temple service, and as they have been heard to express lax sentiments as to worship in general, they have many adherents among the Samaritans, who may be termed political Sadducees.

You will at once see that our friends Jehoiada and Lucas have found these free-thinking Sadducees to be their most formidable opponents in their circuit of Samaria. I asked how these men could possibly ignore the terrible reality of spiritual existences, when so many instances of dæmoniacal possessions were constantly meeting them, whose personality they had every opportunity of testing. Lucas replied that this was even the more extraordinary, as the Shiloh had delegated to them the authority to exorcise demons of evil before their very eyes. I was lost in amazement, and gazed at my two friends with a look that must have betrayed my suspicion and distrust. 'Yes,' said Jehoiada, 'even the devils are subjects to us in the name of the Shiloh. I can easily forgive your incredulity, my dear Sextus; but pray remember that we had no power over these terrible spirits of evil, save in the name of Jesus of Nazareth.' When I could recover myself I asked, 'What said your Sadducees to this palpable argument? How could they gainsay the existence of dæmons, which they had not to receive on credit?' 'Extremes ever meet,' said Jehoiada, 'to avoid believing in the existence of dæmons, they even gifted me with the power of conjuring up these supposed dæmons, which would have been far more difficult to be believed than the reality of the dæmons themselves. These self-opinionated men, who would monopolise all human wisdom, ever refute themselves. By denying certain things that are not inconsistent with human reason, they rush into the belief of the utterly impossible.' 'Others of these Sadducees,' said Lucas, 'said that these spiritual possessions were creations for the occasion, mere phantoms, permitted by Jehovah; and when I showed them that even in this view they must have been divinely-permitted instrumentalities to glorify the Nazarene, Jesus, they were beyond measure enraged, and endeavoured to rouse the populace against us; so we took off our sandals and shook off the very dust from our feet, for a testimony that the very dust was unhallowed by their tread.' On the following morning, the Sabbath, Cornelius and I were early at the gates of Sichem, the place of our former meeting, and we found the Sycharenes fast assembling. On this occasion, my new friend, Lucas, was the chief speaker. To compare these two heralds of the Shiloh were as impossible as it would be invidious. The oratory of Jehoiada was fervid: his arguments were cogent; his sayings weighty. The diction of Lucas was ornate, more rhetorical, and (shall I say), betrayed the man of education. Of the two I should prefer Jehoiada, but the Samaritan seemed to be led captive by the eloquent Syrian. How can I do adequate justice to the oration which he delivered to the men of Sichem! If I had begun to waver in my mind as to the Messiahship of the Nazarene, this oration has restored me to my faith, and when he ceased to speak a

Digitized by Google

murmur ran through the whole assembled throng, and as we bent our steps to our hostelry, we overheard several exclaiming, '*This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world.*'

Our host has introduced us to an aged woman, of threescore years and ten, with whom we had a most interesting conversation, never to be forgotten by me. She told us of her early life, a sad career of shameless infamy—of her five divorces, on account of her flagrant adulteries; of that memorable day when she met the Shiloh at the well of Jacob. She spoke with a countenance radiant with expression, and betokening what its attractiveness must have been in her prime of womanhood; she related that memorable interview, when she quailed before the gaze of superhuman omniscience, when her hard heart was smitten by the tenderness of superhuman mercy; she told us how the loving One forgave her all her past deep sinfulness, and restored her to a right mind, to purity of life; she told us how she had won over not a few of her former paramours to follow the footsteps of the Shiloh, and to learn of him how to walk humbly with their God. Jehoiada and Lucas afterwards accompanied us to the lowly home of this aged disciple, and to use the language of my grand old friend, 'That was none other than the house of God, and the very gate of heaven.'

As we were passing along the street together, Jehoiada was stopped by one who seemed to recognise him; the person was of most exquisitely fair complexion, his hands were of a feminine whiteness, his eye sparkled with an unusual lustre. He exclaimed, 'I cannot be mistaken! Did I not see thee in company with the Shiloh, even with Jesus of Nazareth? 'Tis but some fifteen days ago, you surely must remember me.' My friend, Jehoiada, replied that he could not remember to have seen the speaker before? that he certainly had been with Jesus at Bethabara, in the neighbourhood of Scythopolis, in the Decapholis. 'Even so!' replied the stranger, 'remember you not those ten lepers, near to those passages of the Jordan river? how we supplicated Jesus, Master, have mercy on us! and how he said, 'Go, show yourselves to the priests.' What! said Jehoiada, art thou that Samaritan who returned to fall at the feet of Jesus, and give him the glory due unto his name.' 'I am even he! No marvel that you could not recognise the poor leper, from whom you so lately shrank away in loathing; but the change wrought upon my body is as nothing compared to the mighty transformation in my mind. Remember you not those words, Thy faith have saved thee?' With those words of Jesus, there sprang up in this my heart a new love, a sweet peace, an untold joy!' O how Jehoiada was moved! In that open street he fell upon the stranger's neck and wept aloud; you would have imagined it the meeting of some aged father with a son long estranged but returning home to a father's arms, to a father's heart. Shall I confess it, we all wept aloud. Our new friend (Salathiel he called himself) then turned to Lucas, and said, 'I heard thee at the gates of Sichem this morning! but little did that assembled throng know that there was one in that company who could corroborate so fully your testimony for Jesus. For thirty years have I been an outcast leper! None of these Sycharenes can remember the youth Salathiel, who wandered forth a heaven-stricken leper! But thou, my aged friend, canst bear witness to the truth of my statement: let me accompany you through all the cities and villages of Samaria, that

Digitized by Google

I may enforce your proclamation by declaring how great things God, even our God, hath done for me! The plan delighted Jehoiada and Lucas. They are to go forth through the villages of Southern Samaria; and at the next new moon I am to meet my old friend yet once again, at my father's old quarters in the Castle of Antonia. I have still about twelve days to await this our meeting; and, if I can arrange my military engagements, will visit some of the remarkable spots between these two cities, Cæsaræa and Jerusalem. I am persuaded that we are on the eve of most eventful times; Jehoiada has confirmed this assurance, and thinks I may be able to render some service, if not to Jesus himself, at least to his disciples in the hour of trial. Rest assured, my dearest mother, that my services shall not be lacking.

Since I wrote the above, the Roman governor has arrived; my duties have been chiefly at the palace. Pilate treats me with considerable respect, and his wife is particularly gracious to me. Her father was an intimate acquaintance of our kinsman, Statilius. I wonder whether she ever heard of him in whom Statilius trusted. We had some conversation the other day about these peculiar people, the Jews—their different sects, their antagonism, their Temple, their Sanhedrim. She is well-informed, and I am told has considerable influence over the Procurator. I longed to talk about the great Prophet, but could not get the fitting opportunity. It is utterly impossible that she has not heard of Eliezer being restored to life, but not a hint has she dropped as to this all-absorbing topic of the day. But when I reflect upon it, am I not one of the last persons to whom she could talk upon this point? Is not Sextus Calpurnius, a Roman captain, who has but lately arrived in Judæa, who during his short sojourn has chiefly resided in Cæsarea? Little does she suspect that the Captain of the Imperial band is so intimately associated with the followers of the Nazarene. How could she, or the Procurator, entertain a thought of anything so utterly improbable. As little does she think that such letters as these are being conveyed to Rome with the Procurator's despatches, or that such tidings are read at Rome, at Baiæ, and at Puteoli; and that the Shiloh has such devoted admirers in my mother's household, amongst my mother's friends.

Doubtless such letters as I have been sending to you, have been despatched by many a believer in Jesus, to countries far away; thus preparing the world to receive the tidings of the Blessed of Jehovah. Cornelius and Leonatus constantly write to Syracuse; Agrigentum, Rome; Lucas writes as frequently to Syrian Antioch, Seleucia, Berytus, and Damascus; and Jehoiada still writes, as he was wont, from Rome, to his aged friends, of thirty years in his far-off home. He tells me that not a few are coming up this year to the great feasts at Jerusalem; he fears that they cannot arrive in time for the Passover, but hopes to see them at the Pentecost, some fifty days later. The season has been extremely unfavourable for travelling, and the roads of our more eastern provinces are in bad condition, and exposed to robbers. Jehoiada is hoping that not a few of these, his former acquaintance, will tarry here to die after they have seen the Desire of all the Nations.

* * * * * *

Mayst thou live and prosper.

A. U. C. 786. *Id. Martis.*

Digitized by Google

THE RELATION OF THE BODY TO THE SOUL.

THE paper of Prebendary Constable, in reply to Mr. Jukes, which appeared in the November number of the *Rainbow*, suggests some reflections which it is hoped will not be unacceptable to those who really desire to know what the Scriptures teach in reference to the nature of man. The common theology represents him as a being into whose composition there enters two elements, or perhaps it would be more correct to say, parts —one of these parts, which is called soul, being immaterial and immortal; and the other, which is called body, being material and mortal. The common theology adds to this that the mortal body, in a changed form, is capable of immortality; and that after its death, and at some future period, variously believed to be near or remote, there will be a resurrection of this body—that is to say, a renewal of its life, and that it will then become the everlasting vehicle of the soul, from which it has been temporarily separated. This I take to be a sufficiently accurate statement of what the popular theology teaches on the subject; and it will at once be seen that this teaching gives the pre-eminence to the soul as the nobler part of man, the principle which animates the other part, and makes its instinct with a life which it could not otherwise possess. The theory is that the body exists for the soul, and that though it is necessary to the completeness of the man, there would be life of a very high and vigorous kind without it.

Prebendary Constable has another theory. He says that the scriptural definition of man is much simpler than this—that "man is earth," that the record tells us that "God formed man of the dust of the ground," and that the meaning of this is that "the lifeless figure was man before it had received any breath of life from God." From this argument I turn to the Scripture itself, and there I find two statements, one general and the other in detail. The detailed statement, in the second chapter of Genesis is, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Now I should be content to rely upon this passage, as affording evidence that not one, but two operations were necessary to the formation of man, and that there was no such being as man in existence until God had breathed into the organic structure compacted of dust. The body was a dead thing, without life, and with no capacity of living, until the breath of God swept through it. The more general account of the creation of man, given in Genesis i. 26, 27, is, "And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness. . . . . So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." There are no details given here, and the formation of the body "of the dust of the ground," being a mere matter of detail, is not referred to. The statement is that God created "man in his own image;" and as this description cannot apply to the "lifeless figure" which God had formed "of the dust of the ground," it is evident that the word "man" in the passage includes something else. But what else is included? Again,

Digitized by Google

we turn to the second chapter of Genesis, and we find that into that which God had formed of the dust of the ground, he breathed the breath of life, and that as the result of that breathing, man became a living soul. Here the creative act, which begun with the formation of the "lifeless figure," was completed, and the result was "man"—a "living soul," made, as the mere figure could not be, in the likeness of God. It is useless to appeal to Augustine and Tertullian against this definition of man.

But Prebendary Constable, apparently assuming that his interprepation of Genesis is indisputable, meets the supposed objection, that if the definition of man as "earth" was true "up to the period of God's breathing into him the breath of life, it ceased to be a true definition of him ever after that." To this he answers, that the old definition is subsequently renewed by God, and he cites the closing words of the curse pronounced on Adam (Gen. iii. 17), "Dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return." It is difficult to believe that this passage is seriously quoted to prove that "man is earth;" and all that need be said in reply is, that the text neither affirms nor denies that man is an immaterial and immortal being, but simply declares, in a predictive form, the truth to which sixty centuries bear witness, that that part of man which was formed of the dust of the ground decays and dies, and returns to the dust again. Perhaps there was a special reason why this statement was appended to the curse. The fruit of the tree in the midst of the garden was forbidden to our first parents, and the peril set before them in case of disobedience is expressed in the words, "lest ye die." But the tempter was ready with the assurance, "Ye shall not surely die;" and with the promise that, as the result of eating, they should "be as God, knowing good from evil." Death had been clearly set before them, as the penalty of disobedience; but the tempter quieted their fears and roused their ambition. They desired to be as God in knowledge, and they began to doubt whether they must needs die. Whether the trees spoken of are symbols of something else matters not for the purposes of our argument; they at least represent truths. There was another tree called 'the tree of life,' and man was driven out of the garden, lest he should take of it, and eat, and 'live for ever.' Whatever these things may mean, they must signify this, that man, on becoming disobedient, began to doubt whether the threatened penalty of disobedience could be inflicted on him, and aspired to know and live as God. Therefore it was appropriate that his arrogant pride should be humbled by the renewal of the declaration made to him, in these words, on the morrow of his creation, "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." I take it that that the passage has no other signification than this.

Prebendary Constable having, as he thinks, settled that "man is earth," exteeds his definition to, "man is body, and HAS spirit, or soul." Then he goes on to say that, "though made from the body, the spirit is far nobler than the body. It is the spirit which animates the body, and gives it animal, intellectual, and moral life. It is the subtle essence which pervades it, and which makes man the noble creature that he is, the nobler creature that he was when first he became a living soul." What contradiction and confusion we have here! The Prebendary set out by asserting that the Scripture gave a much more lowly idea and definition of man than Mr. Jukes, who gives the first place to the spirit, and only a secondary place to the body; and yet, on the very next page, I find him

Digitized by Google

talking of the "noble creature" man, (*i.e.*, the body), is made by the noble essence (*i.e.* spirit) which pervades him. Here is the contradiction. Now for the confusion. Prebendary Constable subordinates the nobler to the meaner, thus violating every known law of God. He speaks of soul, or spirit (the subtle essence) as being made *for* the holy—the "lifeless figure," compounded by dust. What would he say if some one were to assert that that mysterious natural force which we know by the name of the electrid fluid, was created for the purpose of traversing the telegraphic wires, and not the telegraphic wires to be for it a free pathway from land to land? Yet the one assertion is not more absurd than the other. The delicate arrangement of nerves in man was obviously constructed by the Allwise Artificer to be the channel of a force already existing, and to which we give the name of the nervous fluid. Adaptation is written on every part of the human frame, and adaptation to what? Not merely to external uses, but to mysterious internal influences, exercised by what we call soul. And if so, then all the delicate organisation of that "dust," which Prebendary Constable says is man, was made for the soul, which he says is not man, but something that man *has*.

And what is this something? The Prebendary gives me a very cloudy answer. "It is the spirit which animates the body, and gives to it animal, intellectual, and moral life. It is the subtle essence which pervades it, and which makes man the noble creature that he is." Here we see that the spirit, though "far nobler than the body," is treated merely as something which gives life, and makes the body noble. In short, it is identified with the breath of life which God breathed into man at the creation, (that breath being regarded merely as a life-giver), and not with the living soul, "which man became when God breathed into him." According to this definition, the soul is nothing but a force—an influence. It is not man, nor even a part of him, but something that he has, and which he may have not, and yet be man.

Let us see whether this, to me, perfectly novel view of the nature of man leads us. According to Prebendary Constable, the body, which "is truly the man," dies, and so there is an end of the man. He has gone, has become a little heap of indistinguishable dust; but the spirit lives on in Hades, not as man, but "as a second representation of the man to whom it belongs." The man rots in the ground, and fertilises the soil, is borne hither and thither by the wind, in impalpable dust, and the atoms of which he is composed may never again be gathered together, since God works as miracles in violation of his own laws. The trump of the archangel may awaken souls, and the power of God may clothe them with immortal bodies; but the identical body, which died a thousand years ago, is irrecoverable, and if that body was truly the man, and the whole of the man, then the man is irrecoverable.

I had reached this hopeless stage, when I found Prebendary Constable trying to comfort me, but not very successfully. He goes on to say, "As the lifeless body is truly the man, so also the living spirit, in whatever condition of life it lives, is in a true, though derived and secondary sense, said in Scripture to be also the man." Now, if I could accept this dictum in connection with what went before it, I should afterwards be prepared to swallow any Roman fable. I am seriously asked, in one sentence, to believe that the separate spirit "is not man," but is only to be "looked

Digitized by Google

upon as a second representation of the man *to whom it belongs*;" and in the next, to believe that the spirit is, in a true, though derived and secondary sense, "also the man." If I can believe these contradictions, why may I not also believe that the body of Christ is in heaven, and at the same time in the wafer on a Romish altar!

Here my comments on Mr. Prebendary Constable's paper should come to a pause, for I desire to take no part in the discussion between him and Mr. Jukes, and I have simply endeavoured to correct a statement incidental to the discussion, which seemed to me to challenge an answer from any one who was prepared to give it. There is, however, in the last page but one of the Prebendary's paper, an illustration so important to my purpose, that I will just refer to it. Commenting upon the wonderful intimations of the nature of the resurrection, given in 1 Cor. xv., under the symbol of a sowing of seed, Mr. Constable says, "The seed is sown in the ground, it is there said to die; and in thus dying it sprouts out, and bears fruit of its own kind manifold. But many things must be considered in this process. *The seed must have in it a living germ;* the seed must *be sound.* The process in the ground has not killed this germ, but has only quickened it from dormancy to active life. *What is called its death, is only the putrefaction of the substance which surrounded the living germ.* If the latter had been killed, if the old seed had putrefied, there never would have been life or growth from the seed." This is true of wheat, or other grain; true of all things that are grown from seed sown in the earth. The germ lives, when the envelope perishes, and God gives the germ a body as it pleaseth him, and "to every seed his own body." But it is not true of the Prebendary's "man"—the lifeless figure formed of the dust of the ground. That dies, and no germ of life remains in it. It utterly decays, so utterly that Mr. Constable says, its restoration must, in a special way, come from God, and not as the result of a natural process. But the apostle's argument for the resurrection of the body rests upon the hypothesis that there is in "the dead" a living germ, which is to be the nucleus, about which the resurrection body will unfold its spiritual beauty. What is that germ? We have seen that it cannot be any particle of the dust of which the body was composed, because that has died utterly—perished in every sense, except the chemical sense. That has not died as the grain, which must perpetuate itself, dies; but died as a thing that may never be restored to its former likeness. What, then, is the living germ which remains, if not the soul, or spirit, which Prebendary Constable says is not man, nor a part of a man, but only something which man has? And if this be so, is it possible that man will be rebuilt out of an "essence" which is not man, to be clothed upon with a body which never was man, even in its external aspect, but altogether different from the body, or man, made out of "the dust of the ground." Why, the result of such a rebuilding would not be man, but a new being who could not be identified with him, and for man there would then be no resurrection.

Suffer me to add the words of the apostle in 1 Cor. xv. 50: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." I understand the words "flesh and blood" to mean the earth-made body of man; for under the finger of God, the dust of the ground became flesh and blood, and when we describe ourselves as dust we use the language of symbol. The resurrection body is to be a changed body—so changed in its constituents,

Digitized by Google

aspects, and power, that the apostle calls it "a spiritual body." It is therefore not the "man" of Prebendary Constable's hypothesis. Where then is the man if he is not here? and not in the spirit, which is only something that man has? If the Prebendary's arguments were tenable, the vaults of Infinite space would echo "Where?" throughout eternity. But the argument is not tenable. It is the body that dies, and the man who lives on until the morning of the first resurrection. It is the man who will hear and answer the summons to the dead—that is, to those who have died in their bodies. The old body of dust will make no response to "the trump of God;" for no germ of life was left in it, and it has no ears to hear. That was a natural body, and the body of the resurrection man is to be a spiritual body; "and as we have borne *the image* of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly;" as we have carried about with us the earthy body of the first man "who was of the earth," so we shall wear bodies like the glorious body of "the Second Man," who "is the Lord from heaven."

The Crescent, Hertford. S. H. ERRINGTON.

THE TWO DEATHS.

WE read of two *deaths* in the word of God, namely, the *sleep* or *death* of the natural body, and the "*second* death." If these *deaths* were understood according to the Scripture, much misconception regarding *death* would vanish; aud statements, in the word of God, would become intelligible, which under the present theological dogmas are perfect enigmas; *e.g.*, the Sadducees came to Christ, and asked him this question respecting the woman who had seven husbands: "In the *resurrection*, whose wife of them is she, for seven had her to wife?" (Luke xx. 33.) This was a *post* resurrection question, and the reply of Christ is very significant. He says, "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can *they die any more.*"

Now, if all the righteous and the unrighteous alike *are immortal*, after the resurrection, as the popular belief teaches, why did Christ make such a statement as this; *i.e.*, "*Neither can they die any more.*" Do not such words conclusively prove, that after resurrection there is to be death, and how can they be explained unless the "second death" be that to which he refers?

Again, in John viii. 51, Christ says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my sayings he shall never see death;" on hearing this the Jews were filled with indignation, and said, "Now we know thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead and the prophets, and thou sayest, if a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death."

Christ here undoubtedly referred to the "second death"—if he did not the wrath of the Jews was quite natural; because Abraham was dead, and he surely was a believer. Had Christ explained his meaning to them,

Digitized by Google

and said, yes, Abraham is dead, has fallen asleep, but I do not refer to this death, which is but a sleep, I am speaking of the "second death"—the lake of fire, into which all unbelievers shall be cast after death, resurrection, and judgment, which is *death eternal.* Had he explained himself thus, the Jews would, in all probability, have said, "Now we know thou hast *ten* devils;" and is not this what theologians of the Origen school say of of those who teach that the "second death" is eternal destruction?

There was some excuse for the Jews not understanding our Lord's saying, as the "Spirit had not yet been given," and Christ had not as yet "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel;" therefore he did not attempt to explain his saying, knowing that if he had the Jews would in their blinded state have failed to comprehend his meanings, as Christ only taught the people as they could bear it (John xvi. 12); but in these days of gospel light and revelation, it is sad to see men's minds so blinded to the truth, through the reception of the dogmas and creeds of men. There being a "second death," of necessity there must be a "first death," that death which has passed upon all men; for "all have sinned," but the "second death" will not affect *all,* as only the wicked will be made to feel its terrible power (Rev. xxi. 8); but upon the subjects of "the first resurrection" "the second death has no power." (Rev. xx. 6.)

Is this "second death" annihilation? Science takes up annihilation, but Scripture utters not a word; therefore as we have not a "Thus saith the Lord" for this doctrine of annihilation, we dismiss it as having no part in the doctrine of the non-eternity of punishments.

Is this "second death" a *life* of eternal torments? If so, how can it be called a *death*? Is not death the article that put an end to *life's* sufferings?

Do we not constantly hear by the bedside of suffering the prayer, "O that the Lord would take me!" Why is death thus prayed for? Simply that death might end the present sufferings. And this is the meaning attached to death by all peoples. But theologians, to make their dogma of the immortality of the souls of all men consistent with their belief in the everlasting torments of the damned, are obliged to teach that *death* in the Scriptures does not mean death, but a *life* of eternal howling in hell! How one can be *death* and yet have *life,* is an enigma, which philosophical theology may attempt to harmonise, but which common sense pronounces impossible, and the word of God ignores. Ah! say they, were not the Ephesians, *before* conversion, "dead in trespasses and sin?" True, and so were they *after* conversion, *dead* to the world, *dead* to the law, etc.; *i.e.* in the one case, their *minds* were *dead* to the things of God, and in the other, *dead* to the things of time and sense.

The *body* was not dead, *death* had not touched it in either case.

But in the "second death" both body and soul shall be destroyed in hell —Gehenna. (Matt. x. 28.) This "second death" will not occur until after the resurrection of the wicked, on the "resurrection of damnation;" and as we know that their *bodies* will arise with them, the verdict of the "Great White Throne" will be, "to cast into the lake of fire," which is the "second death;" and truly this is "a bourne from whence no traveller ever shall return," as the decision is as eternal as the death, in which every sigh is hushed for ever—all suffering gone, and an eternal lull shall reign for ever. The agent of this "second death," "the lake of fire," Gehenna or hell, shall be quenched equally with the fires of Sodom and Gomorrha.

Digitized by Google

These awful burnings having answered the objects for which they were kindled, have been extinguished for ever, though Jude (verse 7) says, that Sodom and Gomorrha are "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," *i.e*, as to the effects produced by the fire. Sodom and Gomorrha being destroyed, and Gehenna now no longer continuing to burn, because they have long since answered the end of their being; and so will it be with the fires of hell—they, too, will cease when the MATERIALS upon which they prey, *i.e.* the wicked, who were to be cast into hell or Gehenna, shall be consumed, for "He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire;" but when the *chaff* is consumed the flames will be quenched. This unquenchable fire simply means, that it will burn until everything that it preys upon is destroyed.

We say, when speaking of a great and destructive conflagration, "the fire raged with *unquenchable fury*;" though it was either subdued by the fire-engines, or burnt itself out, we by no means wish to convey that it never was extinguished.

The subjects of the "second death," and that of the "second coming of Christ," are very imperfectly understood, and the consequence is that the vast majority of God's people are in a *mist* respecting these themes, being badly instructed in "the word and doctrine," owing to our current theological literature and teaching being so deficient in interpreting *literally* the word of God on these subjects, instead of *spiritualising*, such self-evident doctrines as "the second death" and the "second coming."

Therefore we welcome such a periodical as the *Rainbow*, in which these doctrines are stripped of all philosophical spiritualising, and words and phrases taken to mean what they are intended; so that when the apostle says, for instance, "the wages of sin is *death*, but the gift of God is eternal life," he just expressed, in plain language, what he meant.

AN M.D. AND RECENT CONVERT.

ABSURDITIES OF THE YEAR-DAY SYSTEM.

I HAVE expressed astonishment at having been myself so blinded as to believe and teach, as I once did, the doctrines of what may be called, for the sake of brevity, "the year-day" system of prophetic interpretation, because the whole of that system rests upon the assumption that a *day*, in the language of prophecy, stands for a *year*. An assumption for which, I may observe, there is not in the whole Bible a tittle of evidence, not even the shadow of a shade of authority. An assumption also which involves the most palpable absurdities; as *e.g.*, that there shall be "no rain upon the earth for 1260 years!" in which case the earth and all that it contains would (according to these interpreters), have been long since reduced to impalpable dust! Also it would follow that Nebuchadnezzar should be at this moment eating grass with the beasts of the field. For "seven times" were to pass over him in that condition, during which he was to be "driven from men," and his "dwelling to be with the beasts of the field," &c. (Dan. iv. 25.) But a "time" we are told is 360

Digitized by Google

years; and seven "times" are seven times 360—namely, 2,520 years. And as this prophecy was delivered about 570 years B.C., it follows that the term of Nebuchadnezzar's punishment has yet eighty-three years to run ere its completion!

But in truth, to all who know the force of educational prejudice and the influence of long-established opinions upon any subject, such mental blindness as that with which I charge myself will occasion no surprise whatever. Even at the time I most warmly advocated what is called, though most incorrectly, *the Protestant interpretation*, I had continual misgivings of its validity, and every now and then had to go through a long course of argument to reassure myself of the soundness of those views; and withal had to throw into the scale the whole weight of authority. "So many learned and pious men," I reasoned with myself, "have held these views, and lived and died in the firm persuasion of their truth, and shall I now presume to question their soundness?" etc., etc.

Notwithstanding, the said "misgivings" *would* return to the charge again and again, and would not be silenced: until, at length, I resolved to throw aside all "prejudice," and examine the subject for myself alone, in the light only of common sense. This resolve once made and carried out, I was indeed "amazed" to find, as I soon found, that the so-called "Protestant" system of prophetic interpretation was from first to last devoid of all foundation, and nothing more than "the baseless fabric of a vision." The result was such rest of mind as those only can experience who have gone through the same sifting process.

WILLIAM KER, A.M.

THE STATE OF THINGS.

"Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken."—Luke xxi. 26.

I HAVE now been very forcibly struck with the dreadful recklessness of mankind in these last moments of time. The word of God gives us abundant testimony concerning the signs to be expected prior to the return of his Son from heaven; and if we neglect the admonitions of holy writ, and that day takes us unawares, it will fully prove that we have been taking heed to the doctrines and traditions of men rather than the sure word of prophecy. And as the word is "a lamp to our feet, and a light to our path," by prayerfully searching the Scriptures we will understand the past, present, and future of this dispensation.

It cannot be disputed by any intelligent or candid person that we are living in an age of unparalleled wickedness, and that we are on the eve of important changes is generally conceded. To-day Europe is bristling with bayonets, and while they cry peace they prepare for war. There you find the millions of men, armed with the most destructive implements of war, awaiting the orders from the most ambitious kings of the earth, to commence a deadly onslaught; and the time is not far distant when the dreadful time of action will arrive. Still the cry is, peace and safety!

Digitized by Google

We see a strong revolutionary spirit also amongst the labouring classes, and there is commotion amongst the people. We see vice and immorality on the increase, and in many places there is no security for life and property. The secular press fills many of its columns with horrid tales of murder, robbery, and startling suicides. Death is hurrying men to the grave unprepared. Fatal disasters are happening hourly on the land and on the water, on the boats and on the cars. Surely the earth is filled with violence.

And while we look with forebodings of dread disaster on the face of this sin-cursed planet, we also see that in the last year the earth has been convulsed from centre to circumference; and no less than 1,200 to 1,300 earthquakes tell the tale of mighty forces at work under our feet; and the ocean, participating in the shock, rolls on its mighty tidal waves far beyond its bounds, carrying the shipping, together with ought that impedes its course, far inland, leaving wreck and ruin in its path. The pent-up fires in the bowels of this groaning earth find outlets in the volcanoes which vomit lava, thus acting as safety valves, reserving its force until the time appointed.

If we next turn our attention heavenward, we find that there are changes taking place so different from what we have been accustomed to, that men of science are investigating the matter, and note peculiar commotions in the sun and moon; and tornadoes, and storms, and cold, are some of the effects attributed to these commotions. In fact, there is cause enough for us to candidly enquire, What does all this mean?

But there is one other picture I wish to bring before your notice. At this present day, the Bible has been distributed, and the gospel has been preached to every nation under heaven. The Christian religion is no longer unpopular. Nominal Christianity is quite necessary at the present day to secure a standing in society. It is no longer expected for church members to dress plainly. It is not expected of them to keep separate from the world as regards amusements. It appears, "the end sanctifies the means." Festivals, theatres, raffling, dancing, &c., are the order of the day. As it was in the days of Noah, so shall the coming of the Lord be.

I have not given you an exaggerated description of these last-day perils. On the earth we see perplexity among the nations, commotions in society, a spirit of strife and sectarianism among professed followers of Jesus, a disunited state of society, a loss of confidence among business men, nations having no confidence in each other; under the earth commotions, in the heavens commotions. Dear saint of God, lift up your head, for your redemption draweth nigh. The King of glory will soon appear to gather his ransomed ones home. Let us all be watchful. God's grace will be sufficient. We are in the great hour of temptation, that is trying them that dwell on the earth. So let us take heed that we be not overcharged with the cares of this world. Let us be sober. Let us keep separate. Let us watch and pray, so that, when Jesus comes, we shall say, This is our God, we have waited for him.

And, poor sinner, a word to you. You are in a dreadful state for such a day. No friend to deliver you. The burning day is close at hand, and you have no refuge. Come to Jesus! He will save you. Do not delay, for you know not the day nor the hour of the Judge's return. Get ready, for the Judge standeth before the door.—*Advent-Christian Times.*

Digitized by Google

A WORD PICTURE.

BY MRS. JOSEPH FEARN.

Author of "Plain Rhymes for Plain People," etc.

The figures:—a venerable Christian lady and her pupil, a girl of fourteen years. The time, evening (in a quiet room).
The subject of discourse:—Christ Jesus.

Oh! for the artist's pencil, now,
To catch a beauteous scene!
Where grace adorns a saintly brow,
And age on youth doth lean.

The radiance of a setting sun
Illumes that vision blest;
"At evening-time 'tis light" with *one*,
Of Faith's rich fruits possess'd.

The *other*, on her fair young face,
Reflects the ruddy glow;
While each clasps each in sweet embrace,
And loving accents flow.

Their talk is of *the Holy Name!*
His glories they recount;
The spot is lit with sacred flame,
As erst was Tabor's mount.

No more the form of age we see—
For both are child-like there,
"*The youth of immortality*"
O'er flushing silver hair.

They long to dwell with him they love,
In his prepared place;
And he is coming from above,
And they shall see his face.

Already doth the loving breast
His growing likeness show;
While meekly winning souls to rest,
Where living waters flow.

Oh! quickly let thy kingdom come
With Christ our God and King!
And may we share thy children's home
'Mid life's eternal spring!

Brixton.

Digitized by Google

Literature.

The whole Armour of God;" an Explanation of the Christian Conflict, and the Divine Panoply Therefor as Taught in the New Testament, deduced from the Pictorial Instruction of the Old. By LIEUT.-GENERAL H. GOODWYN, Author of "Antitypical Parallels," "The Last Adam," etc. etc., "The God of Peace shall twine Satan under your feet shortly." (Rom. xvi. 20.) London: S. W. Partridge & Co.

THIS volume consists of two parts, the first containing "The Type and its Antitypical Parallel; the Enemy; those who assume a militant attitude, but do not fight; the heavenly family; those who ought to fight, and those who (if they would stand their ground) must fight; and the second, containing "The Divine panoply for the Conflict." Nothing strikes us more forcibly in General Goodwyn's valuable writings than his knowledge of the wonderful union of the Old and the New Testaments. The present volume, rich in holy truth, illustrates this remark. The type of the Christian wayfarer is in the famous Hebrew story, and the seed bears its fruit in the "family" of God. As a military man, perfectly acquainted with the uses of the different pieces of armour, it is most interesting to read that part of the book in which the gallant author treats of the divine panoply for the conflict. On the shield of faith and the helmet of salvation he is very beautiful. We wished much to extract part of this, but could not do it justice without larger quotation than our space allows. Just by way of specimen, both of the author's nervous style and millennial doctrine, take the following pregnant words: "If there should break one doubt on the mind of any Christian student, as to the divine power that will be personally wielded by the Son of God on earth, and the period when the world will in reality be brought into righteous submission to the grace of his sceptre, let him ponder the fourth and fifth verses of Psalm cxxxviii. The words are as follows: '*All the kings of the earth shall praise thee, O Lord!* when they hear the words of thy mouth. Yea, *they shall sing in the ways of the Lord;* for great is the glory of the Lord!' What must be the manner of the glory that can produce such results? In what age of the world's existence have such things been known? Where is the volume of history that can produce a record of the *willing* acquiescence of the rulers and princes of the earth to the will of the Lord, or of submision and *joyous* conformity to the 'ways'? Let Psalm ii. 1—3 be contrasted, where there is a recorded *principle of their antagonism* to the heavenly rule. Yet shall they 'serve the Lord with fear and rejoice with trembling.' But when? The prophetic voice says that it will be when God's Son is '*set as King upon his holy hill in Zion,*' and the inhabitants of the earth are being taught righteousness through his judgments. (Psa. ii. 5—9; Isai. xxvi. 9.) Not until the glorious advent of the Son of Man with power will the kingdom of the world be under the Royalty of Jehovah and his Christ (Rev. xi. 15); for hitherto in his absence he has never been acknowledged as 'Governor among the nations;' nor will he till the time comes for him to assume it according to the decree of the Most High, AS HIS RIGHT. (Ezek. xxi. 27.)" Both as an exposition of Scripture for students, and a closet companion for private Christians, fitted to minister strength and joy to the heart in the day of battle, the book deserves and receives our cordial approbation.

The Pædobaptist's Guide on Mode, and Subject, and Baptismal Regeneration. By JOHN GUTHRIE, M.A. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co.

WHATEVER view of baptism the reader may hold, he must in all honesty admit that Mr. Guthrie has dealt with the entire subject in a clear and conscientious manner. He is charitable in spirit, chaste in style, and logical in argument. Everything turns upon the question, whether his premises are sound, a question which it is no part of our duty to answer.

Digitized by Google

The Book of Job; translated from the Hebrew: with Notes Explanatory, Illustrative, and Critical. By the Rev. JOHN NOBLE COLEMAN, M.A. London: James Nisbet & Co.

MR. COLEMAN is the author of that important work which we noticed at the time of its publication—*Psalterium Messianicum Davidis Regis et Prophetæ*, and now we have to thank him for his translation of the venerable and precious book of Job. The preface is a valuable historical document, and the notes throw great light on many statements and allusions in the text. As a specimen of the translation we quote two verses:

"And his wife said unto him:
'Even yet dost thou hold fast thine integrity,
Blessing God, and dying?'
But he said unto her:
'As speaketh one of the wicked women, so speakest thou;
Truly we receive good from God,
And shall we not receive evil!'"

The Great Antichrist. Who? When? Where? By the Rev. W. J. BOLTON, M.A. London: S. W. Partridge and Co.

THAT "Papal Rome is Antichrist, and the man of sin," Mr. Bolton is fully convinced. In support of this theory, he writes with much earnestness and vigour. Right or wrong in this view, he is quite right in raising a warning voice against a system so full of deadly peril, not only to scriptural religion, but also to the civil freedom of nations.

Poems. By THORNTON WELLS. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

DEDICATED to that "deeply meditative, truthful, and affecting poet, Coventry Patmore," this volume exhibits the characteristics which the dedication appreciates. In many sweetly beautiful lines, which please the eye and touch the heart, there is a deep under tone of thought, which proves that our author is a thinker as well as a seer. He does not merely clothe in graceful rythm that which he sees, but he also frequently suggests the deep meaning that lies behind the visible. The true poet interprets, whilst he sings, thus making poetry the medium of thought. We are glad to offer a hearty welcome to this new writer, and to congratulate him that he has done so well. If the lovers of poetry encourage him, we feel certain that he will yet do better.

The Gospels Consolidated. With a Copious Index. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons.

"THE object of this compilation has been to consolidate the matter of the four gospels, so as to form it into one continuous narrative, and at the same time to enable the reader to ascertain with facility the source from which each part has been derived." The compiler has attained his object with rare success. For students and Bible-classes, the book is truly valuable, and the index greatly enhances its worth, as showing at a glance where leading words may be found. The text is that of the authorized version, but the system of paragraphs has been happily adopted, and in dialogue the change of speakers is indicated by inverted commas, which is undoubtedly a great improvement.

The Resurrection: The Substance of three Expository Lectures. By WM. MORRIS. *The Momentous Question: Who shall Live for Ever?* By WM. MORRIS, London: Elliot Stock.

THESE are admirable pamphlets. We wish for them many thoughtful readers. Mr. Morris stands in the light, and therefore speaks with power.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google